

THE STUDENT WORLD

A quarterly magazine published at 13 Rue Calvin, Geneva
by the World Student Christian Federation

PHILIPPE MAURY, *Editor*

VOLUME LIII

Fourth Quarter, 1960

NUMBER 4

Peace in the Atomic Age

It is not necessary, I suppose, to explain why *The Student World* is publishing a number on "Peace in the Atomic Age". Peace and the threat of an atomic holocaust are the most universal concerns of mankind in 1960, and during the last decade the discussion about war and peace has taken on new life in the churches and particularly in the ecumenical movement. Points of view differ very widely, not about the desirability of peace and the repudiation of war (I doubt whether there are still many Christians who would consider war, especially atomic war, as a conceivable "solution" to international difficulties, as many did some decades ago), but about the practical implications of this rejection of war and longing for peace. We should not be pessimistic about the existence of such differences among Christians, for they merely reflect differences of opinion in today's world, not only between nations and blocs but within each nation. We should rather be extremely optimistic because there is such a genuine concern to avoid war. When people have the same ultimate goal, differences of approach and method are secondary. Community of purpose opens the door to conversation, even compels it, and when conversation occurs, we can always hope for positive results: first, the very simple one that as long as people are speaking together they are not fighting with weapons, and also the much more important one that when they speak together they slowly come to know and understand one another better.

I do not wish to paint a rosy picture of the present situation, but rather to repudiate any passive pessimism which accepts the inevitability of a conflict. Such an attitude is spiritually wrong because it denies the Lordship of Christ over the world and history: as Jesus Christ is Lord of the future as well as of the past, we must live in the present, not as though we were certain of success, but as though there were a reasonable possibility of it when we act in obedience to his will. It is also politically blind, as the history of recent years shows: if conflict between the two big blocs is inevitable, why did atomic war not break out at one of those times when one or the other of the two blocs had a real superiority, which it had no assurance of maintaining? Why is it that, beyond all the violent explosions of propaganda, conversation still goes on more or less publicly in an effort to find some way out of the present deadlock? We therefore have reason to be optimistic, in spite of all the existing differences between nations, ideologies, and even Christians.

But we must also be realistic and make serious efforts to understand where these differences lie. I have referred to the violence of propaganda. It would be one of our greatest failures in the struggle for peace were we simply to follow the easy way of prejudice based on political or national propaganda of whatever origin. This would lead us to try to understand, or rather to fight against, not people with whom we disagree, but straw men set up by the powers that be. This number of *The Student World* brings together a number of articles representing very different points of view, from Christians in several parts of the political world, from different professional backgrounds, and of varying theological outlooks. A special effort has been made to give the floor to scientists, particularly nuclear physicists, and to one military leader. I am sure that all our readers without exception will react violently to at least one of these articles, just as I did when I first read them. However, unless we go beyond this initial sense of irritation or even outrage, we shall be unable to take the next step, which is to engage in a constructive dialogue. Unless we make an effort to understand those people with whom we disagree most violently, unless we acknowledge their good faith, we shall ourselves

contribute to a deterioration of the international situation and increase the threat of war. There will be many opportunities for each of us to participate in this dialogue with Christians with whom we disagree, and we all have a responsibility to seek out such occasions. An ecumenical dialogue has been going on for several years, and will certainly continue. This dialogue at the world level among political, military, scientific, and theological experts will be infinitely more significant and constructive if it is undergirded by the serious thought and commitment of increasing numbers of Christians.

Finally, I should like to say a word about the service of the Federation in this field. I have referred in previous editorials in *The Student World* to conversations which we have had with the International Union of Students, precisely in an effort to understand one another better and thus to alleviate a little the international tension and to overcome barriers of prejudice and ignorance. The Federation will certainly continue such efforts. Moreover, our General Committee, meeting in August in Thessaloniki, Greece, decided to reconstitute a Political Commission, the purpose of which will be "to study political issues which are international in character and relevant to students, produce studies, articles for Federation publications, and other appropriate material for use by national Movements". Among the issues recommended for study are some concerning peace. The General Committee itself gave considerable attention to the problems of peace, and I want here to quote some extracts from its report :

The WSCF cannot remain silent on the question of world peace. Our Lord is the Prince of Peace and demands involvement in the world. Not only does he call us to be peacemakers, but he has given himself fully that our response might be made possible. Peace is not ours to create. It has already been established in Jesus Christ. We can seek only to make manifest that which God has given us.

We, as a General Committee, are aware of our inadequacy to deal completely with this complex subject of peace and its implications. We confess and are ashamed of our ignorance. As students we are called to serious study in this area. We are not under any illusion that our statements here will

be recognized by our political leaders or will result in immediate changes in policy. Nevertheless, it would be both irresponsible and disobedient to God's call if we were to ignore at this crucial period the issue of peace. In all of this, our hope lies in what God can mould out of our human efforts.

At the same time, we are cognizant of the fact that by virtue of being Christian we do not necessarily have profound insight into these complicated problems. Neither are we assuming that there are, or that we have them if there are, so-called Christian solutions. We speak only because Christ's love constrains us to love our fellow men. Our work for peace is not for the sake of being witnessing Christians, but our love and life in Christ demands that we seek to restore man's humanity. Thus, we work that men everywhere may become men in Christ...

The dangers to peace

But there is no peace ! Man's sinfulness cannot be used as an excuse for evading our obligation to work for human peace. But man's sin and estrangement from his God, his world, and himself are the basic cause of the absence of peace. This finds expression in the false pride and selfishness of national and racial groups. There can be no peace apart from Christ. While it is in God's gracious mercy to grant us life and faith in Christ, we are able to look about our human world and view some of the dangers of even a relative peace. In order to achieve a more real peace, we can work to remove these dangers. But the issues and dangers are not self-evident. Our action can be responsible only if it is based on a persistent study of the present situation.

In considering these dangers we again recognize that the issues are complex and that there is no obvious immediate and simple solution. We are aware of some of the vast implications of the following statements but still feel compelled to speak to the best of our ability.

1. *Nuclear Armaments* : While it is arguable that the very existence of atomic weapons on both sides acts as a guarantee of peace, this is peace only in the negative sense of avoiding all-out war, and not in the positive sense of giving a solution to any international conflict. But the risk of an all-out war remains.

While not competent to outline methods for disarmament, arms reduction and/or arms control, the General Committee supports :

a) The right of those nations without nuclear weapons to live under the risk involved in refusing to possess them.

b) The effort of the world powers to seek immediate and effective ways of disarmament, arms control, and arms reduction.

c) The dissemination of information, as complete as possible, on the implications of nuclear testing.

2. *The Cold War* : We are aware of, and feel the pressure of, the "cold war" as it is carried on in the realms of economics, ideologies, psychology, and politics. We abhor it, as it creates fears, sustains mistrust, and often results in the suppression and distortion of truth. This cold war is carried on at present in all realms of our life, and our churches and SCMs should be aware of the danger of being used as tools in it. Even though the Federation makes common cause with students on both sides of the ideological struggle, it refuses to be identified with the ideology of either.

The General Committee supports :

a) All steps to establish diplomatic or other relations between all nations and peoples, particularly in the United Nations, since lack of communication represents one of the main factors of international mistrust and tension.

b) Pastoral care to those who, in their own conscience, have refused compulsory military service, or the payment of their national taxes, or have opposed the cold war in some other way.

c) The efforts of all nations which genuinely seek to improve international understanding among peoples through programs of exchange (scientific, cultural, economic, exchange of students, etc.).

d) The freedom and right of nations to refuse to align themselves with either side in the cold war, in order to work for peace.

3. *Limited Wars* : We work under the grave realization that an all-out nuclear war would be a catastrophe of an unprecedented kind. The prevention of this kind of war

becomes imperative in our time. But we must also face the dangers of limited warfare. Small wars fought with conventional weapons may develop into all-out war without any party wanting it. Considering this fact and the evil of even a small and limited war, the General Committee supports :

a) The playing by the United Nations of an active role in controlling inflammable situations, and calls upon members of the United Nations to create an effective standing international "police force".

b) The application of discipline and restraint to limited warfare itself. (This in no way justifies any such war !)

c) All efforts to work for an immediate and just peace in Algeria as well as in any other limited war. The General Committee urges all Student Christian Movements in countries involved in such limited wars to share in these efforts.

4. *Imperialism* : Colonialism as an institution is everywhere outdated, and in some places being discarded but still in existence. Moreover there are other forms of imperialism (political, ideological, economic, cultural) in our modern world. Colonialism, as well as other forms of imperialism which exist even in newly independent countries, are a severe danger to peace.

The General Committee supports the freedom of all nations and peoples within the family of nations ; it urges dominating nations to forsake their attitude of exploitation and asks all nations to take seriously their responsibility to other peoples...

8. *International Anarchy* : We realize that no true peace among nations will ever exist until they learn to use their sovereignty responsibly and for the sake of international co-operation. Therefore the General Committee calls upon national Movements :

a) Actively to support the work of the United Nations and the development of international law.

b) To work for the acceptance of peaceful solutions of international tensions.

Realistic involvement

The General Committee calls upon national Movements to seek means actively to support the policy outlined above

and to engage in studies and action for peace in their own nations... It urges national Movements to work for the inclusion of the right of conscientious objection in those national constitutions which do not as yet recognize it.

If we were to limit ourselves to making pronouncements, we should fail to be involved in ways which would make any difference in our world. We are sincere only to the extent to which we approach these issues with a sense of our inadequacy and lack of competence with regard to many of them, and of the danger of being satisfied with our own words ; to the extent to which we deal with the immediate issues which must be faced in our own nations before the goal is reached, and only to the extent that we help our government leaders to deal with these immediate issues. We therefore recommend that the WSCF Political Commission and the member Movements of the Federation endeavour with specific programs and projects to help students :

1. To formulate criteria, based on their Christian faith, for deciding which situations justify compromise and patient work on social structures, and which call for civil disobedience.

2. To discover and use opportunities to open and maintain a dialogue between Christians from the East and the West, hoping that the encounter of Christians from different parts of the world can be a service in developing better understanding of their nations, in particular where such conversation seeks to define the Christian task in the work for world peace, as does the Christian Peace Conference in Prague.

3. To realize the importance of intercessory prayer for the establishment of world peace, as defined in the Bible.

In conclusion, let me say that this number intentionally includes very little direct reference to the biblical and theological basis for the Christian concern for peace. This aspect of the question was dealt with in a previous issue of *The Student World* (II, 1956), and I urge all our readers to refer to that number ¹.

PH. M.

¹ This can be obtained from the Federation office for Sw. frs. 1 ; 2s. ; 25 cents.

The Vocation of a Christian Scientist

G. SÜSSMANN

Science has always had an important influence on man's ideas about the world. Moreover, in the last few centuries there has been a great increase in the practical effects of science. Today, the way of thought and life of most people is to a large extent determined by science and scientific technology. One indication of this is the frequent use of the adjective "scientific" in advertising. Science and modern technology are more and more rapidly taking the place of old, firmly established skills and knowledge. This evolution is progressing at a fantastic rate; we may almost speak of a "scientific revolution" to which we are witnesses. Many effects of science are pleasant, others dangerous, but most have a dual role, as their value depends upon our reaction to them. With the help of modern methods, people's nutrition and health can be improved, their freedom of movement enlarged, and their leisure time extended. All this is not to be thought of lightly. Further, scientific technology is today a necessity of life, for without it many people would starve to death. On the other hand, the advance of science has heightened the threat of man-made dangers in an unforeseen manner and brought us to the brink of destruction. A total world war fought with nuclear weapons would be unimaginably horrible, especially since it would certainly not destroy all mankind. But it would be unfair to concentrate on the technology of armaments. The pollution of air and water through technology, the modification of food through modern methods of preparation and conservation, the threat to human life presented by traffic, the corruption of society by psychological methods of advertising and propaganda, and many other things, are likewise the dangers of the rapid development of science. Very often the constructive and destructive possibilities are in close proximity. For example, every nuclear reactor inevitably

produces, besides the desired electrical energy, nuclear explosives and radioactive waste. In many cases we are not even aware of the dangers.

The dual responsibility of the Christian as scientist

In this situation the scientist, the Christian in particular, has a special responsibility. It involves (1) his thought, (2) his teaching, and (3) his actions.

It is an intellectual duty of the scientist to make it clear to himself what role his field of work plays in science as a whole and in human existence as a whole. Modern science is so extensive, so finely ramified, that no one can be competent in more than one small branch of it. Today it is quite impossible to master an individual science like physics or zoology in all its divisions. It is, therefore, all the more important that we do not lose our perspective of the whole and of the related divisions of science. The interest of the scientist in encyclopaedic questions and in the history of science has unfortunately slackened. This is a dangerous development, since it leads to the impairment of the sense of responsibility. Today, many scientists live in two water-tight compartments: their professional and their private spheres. They have little more than vague ideas about the premises, limits, and consequences of their discipline.

The same applies to faith; all too often it is confined within a purely private sphere. Characteristic of this conception of religion is the remark of the young Augustine that he inquired only of God and the soul. Michael Faraday, who was likewise a practising Christian, said that he locked his prayer-chamber before going into the laboratory. This attitude does not take proper account of the Christian faith, which is concerned with human society as well as the individual, with the material world as well as with the psychic domain. The Christian scientist is, of course, obliged to implicate his science in his faith and to consider the relationship between scientific theories and Christian doctrine.

Here great difficulties arise, as well as inadequate theological conceptions, above all from traditional philosophical prejudices. For example, a fundamental reason why many Christians rejected

Copernican astronomy was doubtless the fact that it opposed (non-Christian) Aristotelian metaphysics. Still, it was well known that one should refrain from a too literal and superficial interpretation of the Bible. This unfortunate dependence on philosophical opinions played an even greater part in the struggle over the theory of evolution. The newly gained knowledge in the astronomical field has indeed made it quite clear how *not* to expound the Bible. The fact that such powerful church circles fought against the Darwinian theory that man is descended from the animal kingdom is unfortunately only too closely connected with false humanistic conceptions and sentiments.

The danger in Christian neglect of inorganic life

At present there is a particular theological danger in an incorrect philosophy of organic life. Many people unfortunately think they should defend religion on the borderline between chemistry and biology. The penetration of chemistry into the realm of biology is seen as a threat to faith. The religious aspect of the inorganic world has to a large extent been lost, and now there is a fear of also losing that of the organic world. Thus there arises in both thought and feeling an unnatural gulf between the realms of the inorganic and the organic, whereby the latter is overloaded with religious sentiment inconsistent with the Christian faith. The contemporary mythologizing of the *bios* is sometimes reminiscent of the ancient worship of the stars. We should know, however, that the inorganic things of this earth are as good and as mysterious as heavenly bodies or organisms. The recently achieved artificial synthetization of chlorophyll strikingly demonstrates that one of the lamest attempts to prove the existence of God is that based on the inability of science to explain biological life. More than ten years ago the famous mathematician, J. v. Neumann, pointed out the logical possibility of a self-reproductive mechanism. We must reckon with the fact that it will be possible to explain in chemical terms the spontaneous generation of organic life, in the same way as it has already become possible to comprehend the formation of the planetary system in physical, the evolution of mankind in biological, and man's

development in medical terms. There is no conflict with Christianity. To "explain" in contemporary science really means nothing more than to *describe* in detail the general structure of things. Science does not teach what things are, nor why and wherefore, but only *how* they are, and that purely in terms of space and time. It cannot, on the strength of its method and aim, answer the essential "whys". For example, the term "gravitation" does not denote the reason why free bodies fall but simply the fact *that* they fall. Scientific causal analysis thus remains completely within the bounds of space-time morphology, and is therefore nothing other than (detailed) structural analysis. This removes none of the intrinsic value and mystery of both organic and inorganic creatures. Christian truth has certainly nothing to do with a religious or quasi-religious respect for the stars, life, or man, and the widespread contempt of matter is not Christian but gnostic or neo-Platonic. We do not know what matter is in reality. We cannot simply deny atoms and stars, earth, wind, water, and fire their life and spirit. Matter is well organized to the last detail, and is full of dynamic, and what moves of its own accord is alive. It is incontestable that plants, animals, and men have life and intellectual gifts in an ever new and higher sense. However, this is no proof of a doctrine (*Schichtenlehre*), according to which a higher layer of existence cannot be derived from a lower. Such a view overlooks the purely descriptive nature of science and the so-called derivation of species from lower ones.

"Proofs" of the divine

The incompleteness of our scientific knowledge gives no hint of the divine. On the contrary, the very fact that it is given to us to such an amazing extent to depict intellectually the natural orders of things confirms the wisdom of the *one* Lord, to whom nature *and* reason owe their being. As science does not touch the ultimate questions, it cannot provide proof of God's existence. This fact does not contradict the familiar words of the apostle (Romans 1: 20) according to which God's invisible power and godhead can be seen from the works of creation. "The heavens are telling the glory of God ;

and the firmament proclaims his handiwork" (Psalm 19: 1). This "proof" is itself a divine work and far exceeds human possibilities. Scientific proofs for God, on the other hand, try in vain to ascertain the divine by human methods. They attempt to silence the doubt with intellectual authority, and force the opponent into agreement. This contradicts the spirit and the essence of the Christian faith. An unbiased person will see in the natural order the power and wisdom of the creative spirit, as one can see the wind in branches and leaves. Yet that has as little to do with the cosmological proof for God (which infers a *prima causa* of the world) as with the limits of applicability of the scientific conceptual systems or with modern theories according to which the world is limited in space and time. Nor can scientific proof of God's existence be drawn from modern cosmology, for a "God hypothesis" is not to be found in science (Laplace). This corresponds to the first three commandments, according to which God may not be made a power or hypothesis together with others.

The scientific view of natural laws

The form and movement of things are to a considerable extent determined by natural laws. This often presents a difficulty for the biblical belief in the constant activity of God. But this supposed difficulty rests on misunderstanding. In the first place, the expression "natural law" suggests the misconception that nature is a mighty being with its own powerful laws, like the state. But it is in contradiction to the abstract way of thinking of modern science to conceive of the so-called natural laws as causes or powers which perhaps — in so-called miracles — may be nullified or transgressed by stronger — so-called supernatural — forces. "Natural laws" are, in fact, nothing more than human attempts to formulate space-time structures or orders. Many of these structures are so constituted that they can be interpreted as "causal connections", but it would be absurd to take them as actual causes. No natural law is a logical necessity; every one is a hypothesis. We have got so used to many of them that we easily accept them as a matter of course, and find it very difficult to imagine that they may not exist. But

familiarity is not certainty, and lack of imagination is merely a characteristic of individuals which cannot produce anything substantial. A great deal of what we are unable to imagine is nevertheless real and true — science gives good examples of this. Only in pure mathematics, where thought stands alone, does science give us absolute certainty. Natural science only yields a greater or lesser degree of probability. The lasting applicability of even the most insignificant natural law cannot ultimately be deduced, but is something of a wonder. We have no reason to assume that natural laws convey a kind of "necessity of nature". It is an unjustified presupposition to term natural laws or contingencies "blind"; one can see them as orders and arrangements. The Bible attests that all natural occurrences come directly from the hand of the Creator and Preserver. In more modern terms: God disposes of every single atom, and the world is at no moment independent. Natural laws cannot restrain the activity of him who "gives clouds, air, and winds their path, motion, and orbit" (Paul Gerhard). On the contrary, through science the Creator allows us to contemplate, in so-called natural laws, his creative mind (Kepler). The existence of natural laws poses no problem for the doctrine of the universal activity of God, but rather man's self-will (cf. Jeremiah 8 : 7).

Science is limited in the sense that it cannot answer all the questions which are unjustifiably put to it. That is, it can pose and answer only such questions as refer purely to space-time relations. It does not interpret things and events but gives us an exact description of them, without value-judgments. But in this sense, science is unlimited, since everything can somehow be classified objectively, if need be, under the category of the "hitherto unique". It is nonsense to speak of "violation of a natural law"; instead we can only speak of an event which lies outside the scope of the natural law in question. In many cases it can be fitted in with a natural law of a higher order with an extended range. Whether all occurrences are ultimately subject to natural laws (*i.e.* to constancy and recurrence), or whether there are things which are singular and unique in an ultimate sense, is an open question as far as science is concerned. The biblical conception of the — divine or demonic — miracle has no logical connection with this. In natural

science it does not occur at all, as the conception of colour does not occur in purely physical optics. Miracle is the name given to those events which are so unexpected that they force men to a fresh consideration of the ultimate questions. Yet in the face of such an event, it is possible to withdraw to the objective distanced attitude of science (Luke 16: 31). This abstract, purely rational attitude is always possible logically, quite independent of the fact that it is humanly inadequate.

As opposed to the determinism of the so-called classical mechanics, which between 1600 and 1900 was considered the basis of all science, modern atomic theory, the so-called quantum mechanics, can on principle precalculate the majority of events only with probability (corresponding to Heisenberg's principle of uncertainty). This fact is of significance for some problems of philosophy, but it contributes nothing to the problem of miracles nor to the understanding of man's free will. Nor is the autonomy of conscious decisions, called free will, dependent on an indeterminism of the brain functions even when all mental impulses correspond to physical processes. (This becomes obvious when one considers that the motives are always partly unconscious.)

The object with which science deals is not some section, but the entire world, including man. But science deals with it only under one very specific aspect. Physical acoustics give a characteristic example of the universality and intrinsic completeness of the scientific approach and also of its extraordinary exclusiveness and abstractness: tape-recordings are mechanically reproduced, although they may contain subtleties of individual musical expression. This shows that artistic qualities do not reside in the gaps in physics. And yet the concept of tone does not occur in pure physics which considers sound only in one respect, *i. e.* in the form of "silent" space-time patterns called sound waves. People find it particularly easy to agree about the physical aspect of things. However, it would be a mistake to think that only that which is determinable in this way is real. What we see in the aesthetical, ethical, or theological aspect is not the less real, because it is intimately related to the individual. (Relations are just as real as predicates and subjects.)

The substance of this section can be summarized in the words of the well-known physicist, C. A. Coulson : "God must be found within the known and not the unknown." It is a serious error to limit God to the gaps in our own knowledge, for "gaps are usually filled and God is not a stop-gap" (C. F. v. Weizsäcker). Further : "Science is an essentially religious activity" (Coulson). It is no accident that modern science came into existence in a Christianized culture. "Science is one part of religion, and the splendour, the power, the dynamic and progressive character of science are nothing but the splendour and the power and the dynamic character of God, progressively revealed to us" (Coulson).

The responsibility of the scientist to the public

A further duty of the scientist is to talk over with other thoughtful people the ideas and insights entrusted to him and to pass them on orally as well as in writing. The dangers of exclusive specialization must be overcome in teaching and study also. Fellow-citizens not scientifically trained have a right to be informed, in a manner which they can comprehend, about the progress of science, its blessings and its perils. The government of one's own country naturally has the same right. In this the scientist must not shirk from speaking about the prospects and limits of his science. Misleading, pseudo-scientific doctrines, like racism, the bad "myth of the twentieth century", must be publicly and firmly opposed. For the Christian scientist such a service to truth is inseparably bound up with his position as a witness to Christ. The Christian cannot be indifferent to the conceptions which are spread abroad ; he must strive to see that the moral conscience of science becomes as sensitive as its intellectual conscience already is. For example, during the coming winter term at Hamburg University there will be an interfaculty seminar on the dangers of atomic energy. It is being organized by a young Christian scientist who has made himself available for such tasks for some years.

It is often said in this connection that a researcher who has discovered something which constitutes a danger for mankind should conceal his discovery. That may be right in extreme

cases, but we should not fall into the error of taking this absolutely extreme situation as typical of a scientist's ethics. Science is — today more than ever before — a social and international phenomenon. Characteristic of this is the discovery of the splitting of the atomic nucleus. When in 1938 O. Hahn published the results of his research, he had no idea of the possible consequences. A few months later, however, scientists from different countries had already clearly seen the possibility of a chain-reaction. Soon after the instigation of war by Nazi Germany, the American government was urged, strangely enough by the former pacifist, Einstein, and by other physicists, to construct an atomic bomb to forestall the Germans. The individual research-worker, as we know him from novels, exists today only in our imagination. Modern science has always been public, and here there are no esoteric doctrines which are restricted to one specific group of people. The scientist has generally not only the moral right, but even the duty, to lay his results open for discussion by his colleagues and to publish them. He will have to insist again and again that there should be an end to militarily enforced secretiveness about purely scientific material. It contradicts the spirit of modern science and is, moreover, dangerous, since it increases the prevalent mistrust between the nations. Trust is urgently needed. One of the best ways of promoting it is knowledge and understanding of other countries and peoples. To this end it would be useful to exchange as much information as possible. By this method, rather than by concealment, much of the danger would be removed from scientific discoveries.

The moral responsibility of the scientist

The particular responsibility of the scientist lies in the realm of research and teaching. No one, however, is purely a scientist, so it happens again and again that scientists are faced with moral problems which are only partly of an academic nature. This is especially evident in the medical profession, and it is therefore not at all surprising that we find here the oldest scientific professional ethics (Hippocratic Oath). Today we find ourselves confronted with the task of developing a corresponding code of ethics for the other branches of know-

ledge. So far there have only been some preliminary approaches. An example, together with the previously mentioned letter from Einstein to Roosevelt, is the so-called "Franck Report", which already in the early stages of nuclear weapons indicated the incalculable physical and moral dangers inherent in them. This report by seven American physicists to their Minister of War was written during the war and before the dropping of the American atom bomb on Japan. A counter-example is the affirmative answer given to the American government by a commission of scientists set up to study the question of whether Japan should be attacked with atom bombs. This decision should not be defended, as it unfortunately repeatedly is. (He who tries to justify himself is scorning the reconciliation offered to us in Jesus Christ, and he who condemns others is himself in danger of being accused.) The Soviet physicist, Kapitza, refused Stalin his co-operation in the development of nuclear weapons. The story of the physicist, Fuchs, who deceived his friends and betrayed British atomic secrets, is well known. The criminal experiments on prisoners in Nazi concentration camps are notorious. There is disagreement over vivisection and other animal experiments. Many people are afraid of scientific technology because it restrains nature. This is an important point which we should not forget. I am convinced, however, that it would be wrong to put it first. We must not overlook the fact that in many countries nature itself is feared by the people. So long as there are still so many unsolved human problems, concern about nature must take second place.

Man is on the point of entering interplanetary space. We must reckon with his being able to produce, artificially, small living creatures. (Today there is nothing to deny this possibility ; supporting it is the fact that for thousands of years men have been able to breed and cultivate new forms of animal and plant life. There is certainly nothing unnatural about the rise of life from inorganic matter. Even until 1800 it was thought that worms could arise from mud. Although that is incorrect, there is at the bottom of this false belief a conception of nature which is not as bad as romanticism later led one to believe.) That the Creator has endowed his image with creative faculties is nothing new, but would it not be impious to produce life

artificially ? Artificial fertilization has been used for some time past. The personality of man can be profoundly changed by chemical or physical means. One of man's chief problems has always been that he can do a great deal, more than he dares. Modern science and technology have substantially aggravated this problem. Where are the limits which man must not overstep ? "For what does it profit a man if he gains the whole world and loses or forfeits himself ?" (Luke 9 : 25). We are faced with new kinds of ethical problems, and scientists and Christians must realize that they in particular are responsible for solving them, for "to whom much is given, of him will much be required" (Luke 12 : 48).

War and Peace in a Technical Age¹

GERD BURKHARDT

Since time immemorial man has aimed at subjugating the forces of nature, at utilizing them for his own ends. Throughout the ages he has used the energy which derives from all the natural processes of our planet : the power of wind and water, the radiation of the sun, and the combustion of carbon. He has lived on the supplies stored up with the help of the mysterious assimilation process, the result of radiation of the sun on the earth, through millions of years of organic life. By releasing the energy hidden in the atomic nucleus, man found the key to a source of energy which by itself does not play a great role in earthly processes, though from it the sun and the millions of stars draw the energy which they reflect in the form of light and thermic radiation, which in turn makes possible life in the cosmos.

Year by year for millions of years, the sun has been radiating a thousand million times more energy than the annual consumption of the whole of mankind today. This demonstrates, on the one hand, the relationship of all human endeavour to the cosmos, and, on the other, the significance of the fact that man has gained access to this enormous cosmic energy. He is not only independent of the limited stores of energy on our planet, but also able to change the very foundations of life, to upset the precarious biological balance which our world has attained, and even totally to destroy life on earth.

This is something so fundamentally new in the history of mankind that we may well speak of the beginning of a new era, of the atomic age. This new age has not been inaugurated only by the release of nuclear energy. It is not by chance that other revolutionary scientific and technical inventions are appearing simultaneously : the penetration of space by rockets ; the creation of primitive thought processes by means of electronic

¹ An address delivered at the third Christian Peace Conference, held in Prague, Czechoslovakia, September 6-9, 1960.

valves, and in biology the cultivation of previously unknown forms of life. Obviously we stand on the threshold of an era in which it will be possible for man to create life artificially. There seem to be no limits to technical developments, which are proceeding in all areas with frightening speed.

The question inevitably arises of whether in all this man is not overstepping the command of the Bible "to subdue the earth", whether man is *allowed* to do all he *can* do, and whether he should not set limits to his own actions. It is obvious that if technical development is left to itself, this limit will be set by mankind's self-destruction. However, it is impossible simply to shackle scientific development and technical progress, since they are urgently needed for the rapid extension of the welfare of man. It is therefore important that people should adapt themselves to the new conditions created by technical development, and that this development should be so directed that their adaptation will not have to be made at the expense of their basic human rights. Men who live in large cities cannot move about as freely today as they could when there were no automobiles; they must accept a certain limitation on their freedom. Similarly, states in an atomic age must accept certain limitations on their sovereignty, since all are interdependent as never before.

I want now to deal with nuclear power, especially nuclear weapons, since the complex problems in this sphere are typical of those raised by the whole atomic age, and also because the atomic bomb has brought in its wake an urgent and inescapable demand that nations should achieve a new level of relationship and no longer regard war as a realistic method of settling political conflicts.

Technical data on the atomic bomb

Two different physical processes can create the energy which is released in an atomic explosion. In the so-called "nominal atomic bomb" or A-bomb, it is the nuclear *fission* of certain chemical elements with a high atomic weight, discovered by Professor O. Hahn, especially of the uranium isotope of atomic weight 235, and of plutonium. The bombs which were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki were of this type.

The explosion nucleus itself is about as large as a tennis ball and weighs only a few kilogrammes. The explosive force of these bombs is equal to that of about ten to fifty thousand metric tons of chemical explosives.

In the hydrogen or H-bomb, the process of nuclear *fusion* occurs. Atomic nuclei of light atomic weight, especially hydrogen nuclei and neutrons, unite to form a helium nucleus. This is the process which takes place in the burning centre of the stars. This reaction can occur only through the explosion of a normal A-bomb. The bomb can be provided with a coat of fission material so as to increase the radioactivity which arises in this process (these are the so-called impure bombs). Its explosive force is about one thousand times greater than that of an ordinary A-bomb and represents the force of about twenty to forty megatons of chemical explosives. (One megaton is one million metric tons.) This means that the explosive force of one such bomb is as great as that of all the bombs exploded during the second world war put together.

Atomic bombs act in a fourfold manner :

1. As with a bomb using ordinary explosives, a blast occurs. This demolishes buildings within a radius of ten to fifteen kilometres of the centre of explosion.

2. The explosion is accompanied by a heat-flash which travels as fast as light and causes secondary burns to unprotected persons as far away as fifteen to twenty kilometres.

3. The bomb has a completely new effect which distinguishes it from traditional weapons. This is produced by the radioactive radiation which is released at the moment of detonation ; gamma rays of tremendous intensity are released which have deadly effects on unprotected persons up to a distance of three to four kilometres.

4. The detonation gives rise to radioactive fall-out which may spread over large areas and which may persist in some materials, with decreasing intensity, for months and even years.

It is apparent that a single bomb of megaton size can practically destroy a large city, and kill the majority of its inhabitants, if they have not taken anti-air-raid precautions.

Defence and the "percentage ethic"

Very detailed experiments have been made in the United States to determine the feasibility of civil defence for a city of about two million population. A type of air-raid shelter has been devised which would provide optimum protection as far as the number of survivors is concerned, and we know that the proper defence of one such city would cost five hundred million dollars, with the chance that about sixty per cent of the population would survive the immediate explosion. But if their lives were really to be saved, there would have to be emergency camps at a sufficient distance from the city centre to have been spared by the attack, and there would have to be means of transport and rescue parties to move survivors from the air-raid shelters. These rescue parties would be able to move forward only gradually, as radioactivity decreased. It would require several days to rescue people in those areas of the city in the path of the wind, and the rescue parties would have to be relieved after a few hours, so that the degree of radiation to which they were exposed would not exceed a certain limit. And even then the sixty per cent would survive only if the environs of the city were to remain intact and if only one bomb were to fall, conditions which certainly cannot be assumed in a war. This number does not, of course, include those who would be unable to reach the shelters because the air-raid warning did not come soon enough. Nor have we considered the scenes that would occur outside the closed doors of the shelters, nor the behaviour of people who are cooped up in cramped quarters, who may know absolutely nothing about the fate of their families, and who have to wait until rescue parties reach them!

Finally, when appraising this anti-aircraft defence, we must clearly recognize the monstrosity of such a computation of percentages. In their gigantic efforts to increase the numbers of those who might hope to survive, men neglect the efforts to prevent the occurrence of such a catastrophe, and are satisfied with their questionable success in ensuring that a certain percentage of mankind will live through it. People are trying to meet the dangers of the growing domination of the technical

sphere with this "percentage ethic", and are therefore incapable of a decisive attack on the problems of this new age.

Thus far we have spoken only of the effect of the bomb on the spot which it hits directly, but it is not limited to this. Radioactive fall-out may, under certain meteorological conditions, cause deadly contamination which may affect up to fifty per cent of the unprotected people in an area up to eighty kilometres from the point of impact. It is true that this radioactivity ceases after a time, but there remains a long-lasting contamination by certain radioactive products, the most dangerous of which is strontium 90, which, because of its chemical affinity with calcium, accumulates in plants, enters the human body with food, and is deposited mainly in the bones. An area contaminated by strontium 90 is uninhabitable for a long time, and it could be many years before it would produce a harvest which could be used for the nourishment of man. The American physicist, Libby, has estimated that under certain meteorological conditions an area 560 kilometres in radius would be so contaminated by H-bomb fall-out that it would have to be evacuated.

Results of a mass atomic attack

In a serious conflict, the enemy would not be satisfied with dropping one bomb. On the contrary, he would use enough super-bombs to ensure that his adversary could not retaliate. Though we have no figures, we can nevertheless assume that the secret arsenals of the two atomic powers are very large; cautious estimates speak of atomic explosives equal to about six thousand such super-bombs. Experts estimate that present launching possibilities would permit the simultaneous dropping of 1,500 H-bombs, each with an explosive force of twenty megatons. Such an attack would destroy ten to twenty per cent of the population of either the United States or the Soviet Union, and would, of course, totally disrupt economic organization. But even the countries not directly involved in the war would not go unscathed. In Europe about twenty million people would die as a result of radioactive products which would be projected even into the troposphere

and, as a result of air currents, would form a belt encircling the world, and would again reach the earth with rainfall. Five to ten per cent of the population would be killed by radioactive fall-out, thirty per cent would suffer serious injuries to which they would later succumb, and all would be exposed to serious genetic damage, whose destructive effects would be seen only in succeeding generations. The horrific total result of such a large-scale atomic attack, which need not last more than an hour, would be a thousand million dead, with casualties equal among those who were at war and those who were not.

The human imagination is incapable of grasping even approximately the extent of the catastrophe. Numbers remain abstract and unreal. But there can be no doubt that our present-day technical possibilities could produce such a holocaust, and so it is a reality with which we must reckon. Through the use of atomic weapons, in conjunction with chemical and biological warfare, it is today possible practically to destroy whole nations and continents. Gunther Anders expresses aptly this reality which seems so unreal when he says: "The man of today can do more than he can even imagine."

The political leader who bases the defence of his country on atomic weapons lacks real imagination, however emphatically he may assert that he knows their precise effect. Even though he knows that their use would mean the death of millions, can he really imagine these numbers? The soldier who is trained to use this weapon also lacks this imagination. He himself could never kill even a small fraction of the people he would annihilate by pressing a button. Technical progress kills for him, and reaches far beyond the sphere of his experience. The purely technical perfection of modern war machinery obscures this inhumanity, and does not allow it to penetrate fully our consciousness.

The atomic bomb as a weapon and as a deterrent

It is against this background that we must appraise realistically the world situation. Those in power were not aware of all these facts when they ordered the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. They looked upon them as just another weapon,

only more effective. One day historians, without making any ethical judgment, will regard their decision as the most fatal blunder of our age. The physicists who developed these weapons realized what the effects of this decision would be, but their warnings and protests went unheeded. The military saw the possibility of developing an "absolute weapon", which would force the enemy to capitulate, and against which there would be no defence. We have practically achieved this "absolute weapon" in atomic rockets charged with H-bombs which can be launched from mobile bases. But an "absolute weapon" paralyzes itself, if the enemy also possesses it, for its use inevitably, provokes one's own destruction. An "absolute weapon" excludes war as a realistic political measure. The super-bomb is no longer a weapon in the proper sense of the word : it is a deterrent, which by its very existence makes its use impossible.

Thus we live with the bomb in what Churchill has aptly called "the balance of terror". Up until now it appears to have been an efficient deterrent. It is quite probable that, had it not been for fear of the bomb, the present situation might long ago have issued in a third world war. At the same time, only an insignificant number of people realize how hazardous is this threat of reprisals, when none of the atomic powers can be sure that in the case of a surprise attack, it would have the power to retaliate ; furthermore, a firmly entrenched belief that the enemy's possibility of retaliation can be destroyed at one stroke in itself constitutes a danger of war. Only quite recent developments have made possible a real, because invulnerable, deterrent strategy. The fact that the catastrophe has not occurred is to my mind proof of the fact that responsible leaders on both sides are not yet as well prepared for war as the propaganda of the antagonists so often claims.

"The balance of terror"

Can we rely on the maintenance of this "balance of terror" ? Can we and must we learn to live with the bomb ? I shall not deal here with the ethical question of whether it is possible to assume the responsibility for a way of life that seeks to protect itself against every menace by threatening to employ a weapon

whose actual use would in every case be at variance with moral law. It seems to me that for a Christian there is only one possible unequivocal answer. However, here I shall try rather to analyze this "balance of terror" from the technical point of view.

In the first place, it must be said that this is not a static but a dynamic balance which is ever shifting. Technical development goes on, and a new balance must be constantly arrived at in accordance with the latest achievements. A break-through on one side, for example in the form of a new and effective defence against flying rockets, would lead to a dangerous shift of the balance. This means that the atomic powers must continually strive to keep their armaments at the highest technical level. This fact conditions the armaments race and the amount of money spent on it, which is higher than ever before in history. The cost of armaments for the next twelve years in the whole world is estimated at about two thousand milliards of dollars. This is equal to about six thousand dollars to every wage earner (estimated at one in every four persons) in the nations both East and West which are participating in the armaments race. Monstrous sums which are being devoted to totally unproductive ends! All weapons become obsolete in a few years. And such sums are being spent in a world, the majority of whose inhabitants suffer from undernourishment!

The armaments race presupposes secrecy, which in turn leads to espionage. In a situation where decisive military action can take place within a few hours, even minutes, every army which is responsible for the safety of its country must try by every means to learn about the military capacities and intentions of any prospective enemy. "The dirty business" of espionage is an inevitable accompaniment of the present policy of deterrence, but it in turn increases the tension, which greatly endangers the stability of the balance arrived at. In fact, the accidental outbreak of war must be regarded as a supreme danger. If this delicate balance were to be upset, we would be instantly in the midst of a war nobody wanted. The threat of destruction by atomic bombs is effective only if it can be carried out at any moment, even at the very moment when the enemy is beginning an attack. It is therefore of vital importance to be warned in time of the imminence of such an attack,

and this obviously demands a warning system, worked out in the most minute detail, and unrelaxed vigilance. The demands which are thus made on both the perfection of the technical equipment and the nerve resistance of those responsible for it are so great that the possibility of failure, whether of men or of equipment, cannot be completely excluded. Enough has already been said about what such failure would mean.

Even though the atomic balance itself is not stable, it nevertheless condemns politics to immobility and stagnation. It consolidates the *status quo*, with all its tensions, and where political change is attempted, it leads to the brink of the precipice on which all our political leaders are balancing.

To rescue the possibility of defence from the "all or nothing" alternative, an effort is being made, fully in keeping with traditional military thinking, to provide for small, "limited" wars, and to rehabilitate atomic weapons as weapons in the full sense of the word, by introducing what are called tactical atomic weapons. It is hoped that conflicts may thus be localized, that armed aggression may be met with force, and that by the use of weapons with a limited effect it will be possible to prevent these conflicts from becoming a world war. The great weapon of retaliation meanwhile remains in the background. Experiments made so far, fortunately only of a manœuvre type, have not been too encouraging. The effect of even such "small" weapons would be such that at least the countries directly involved would be devastated, and there is no assurance that such a conflict could be localized in a critical area like Europe.

This development is fraught with another tremendous danger. The smaller nations will naturally strive to take responsibility into their own hands, especially in any small conflicts in which they would be the first hit, and they will try to gain influence in the power bloc to which they belong. Their politicians may be tempted by the exciting prospect of having at least tactical atomic weapons at their disposal. Someone has calculated that every large industrial country is technically capable of producing within five years its own atomic bombs, without any help from outside. France has already made the break-through, and it seems that other nations will soon follow. This is a step towards atomic chaos. There is practically no possibility of stopping

the uncontrolled spread of explosive atomic material, and this will inevitably lead to a great catastrophe. It is really "five minutes to twelve": time to try to stop this development which is a logical consequence of the present world situation.

But is it possible to stop it? The deterrent effect of the atomic bomb is only operative when there is a readiness to use it. Otherwise no one takes the threat seriously and it loses its effect. The pre-condition of this readiness is that the nations be convinced that its use is inevitable. This will be the case only if the enemy is painted as the embodiment of all evil, who must be destroyed by every means. An absolute weapon creates an absolute enemy. A policy of deterrence can flourish only in a cold-war climate. In an atmosphere of distrust, nations seek security; they think they can attain it through the atomic bomb, and they thus intensify the distrust. The way in which this vicious circle forms was demonstrated in an article by Hanson Baldwin in the *New York Times* last March, which expressed the hope that the Geneva conference on the cessation of atomic tests would fail. According to him, any agreement would inspire false hopes that it is possible to negotiate, and thus Western military defence would suffer. Do not misunderstand me: these are not the words of responsible political leaders in the United States; neither do I regard the writer as a war-mongering capitalist. He probably fears the outbreak of war as do the majority of people on our earth. This is simply the idea of deterrence carried to its logical conclusion; though it is a "logic of madness", to use the expression of Professor von Weizsäcker, it is a completely consistent logic.

Disarmament and mutual confidence

Our concern is how this devilish circle in which today's political leaders are ensnared can be broken. All statesmen, East and West, are unanimous in demanding general disarmament and the prohibition of atomic arms. This demand is inevitable, but not sufficient. Even if all the bombs in all the world were destroyed, the knowledge of how to make them would still exist. If a serious conflict were to break out, the powers could produce new bombs in a relatively short time.

The only sufficient guarantee is the sincere desire on both sides for co-existence, that is, the complete renunciation of war. This is imperative at the beginning of the atomic age. The majority of people see this as utopian. However, wars are not a natural law but an historical phenomenon. Slavery was such a phenomenon, though for centuries it was regarded as a natural law. Christ himself did not take a stand against slavery as an institution, just as he did not take a stand against war. His commandment was, deal with your slave as you would your neighbour. Slavery has long since been repudiated in most of the world, not least because machines made it superfluous and because it is an offence against moral law. The same is true of war : war in an atomic age is incompatible with the principles of Christian ethics, not because the horrors it creates are quantitatively increased, but because qualitatively its character has been basically changed. We see here an astonishing reversal : the so-called "realistic politician", who appeals to what he calls unchangeable human nature and in his political calculations counts on the inevitability of war, has become a hopeless utopian, while those who deny the validity of war find support not only in the emotional arguments of the pacifists but also in the simple technical facts.

Though this denial of the validity of war is finding increased expression, it is impeded by the ideas which today determine world politics and which are based on the constant threat of the atomic bomb. Total disarmament can be achieved only when armaments become superfluous. The pre-condition of this is the cessation of the cold war. But this presupposes disarmament, which is today made difficult by mutual distrust. Mutual confidence can come into being only if it is empirically justified by control, whose introduction again presupposes a minimal degree of trust.

I do not believe that it is possible to get over this hurdle all at one go. Human relations change incessantly, and the technical developments of recent years were really a "surprise attack". This most difficult crisis in the history of mankind can be surmounted only step by step, by steady and persevering common effort. Mutual trust cannot be "switched on" like a light : it must grow slowly. Let me quote part of a conversation

which the American physicist, Leo Szilard, had with one of his Russian colleagues.

"What do you mean by trust?" he asked. "Do you expect the American people to trust the Russian government? They do not even trust their own! How then can you expect them to trust someone else's? But", he added, "we may have good reasons not to trust any government, including our own, but we have no more reason to distrust Russian engineers and scientists as individuals than we have to distrust our own American colleagues."

Hopeful beginnings

Here is a point from which hopeful beginnings can be made. I see this conference as one of them. It is a great accomplishment to bring together, in the spirit of Christianity, people who, though they live in a world divided into two hostile camps, nevertheless, as shepherds of their people, have a common faith, and try, regardless of frontiers and the difficult conflicts of the past, to build the foundations for mutual confidence and so contribute to the great task of our time.

As a scientist, I should like to point out another possible starting-point. For several years, scientists from East and West have been meeting at what is known as "the Pugwash Conference". I believe that in addition to making possible the personal contacts and friendships through which misunderstandings are cleared up, these conferences have also a deep political significance. Every government is becoming increasingly dependent on the decisions of its scientific experts. Moreover, the developments of the last decades have shown that scientists are frequently capable of foreseeing more accurately the effects of their discoveries than are the politicians who have grown up in the old traditions, and that their advice, which is unfortunately seldom followed, is usually justified by future events.

Two years ago at the large conference at Kitzbühl, Austria, seventy natural scientists from twenty countries of East and West published a manifesto which became known as the "Vienna Declaration", and which tried to inform the world about the dangers in the present situation and ways to over-

come them. It is remarkable that, after a long and careful discussion in which some points were vigorously debated, it was nevertheless possible to issue a common declaration on which all present could agree. And this was no general statement, but contained very concrete warnings and specific proposals. Two sentences from it summarize what I have been trying to say here : "In view of the difficulties of the technical situation, scientific workers gathered here feel it to be their duty to point out to their fellow-citizens and to their governments the necessity for a policy which would strengthen international confidence and diminish fear. Confidence cannot be created by mere proclamations of good will ; this demands a long process of political adjustment and active co-operation." It seems to me that the sober technical demands of our technical age, as they were set forth in this declaration, are in full agreement with the ethical injunctions of Christianity. May all people East and West realize that in this age of technical development they are citizens of one world and that they have only one common enemy — atomic war.

Providence and Peace

WILLIAM G. POLLARD

The growing stockpiles of nuclear weapons in several countries and the attendant prospect of the outbreak of unrestrained nuclear warfare present an agonizing problem to the Christian conscience. It is a problem which more than any other, with the possible exception of that of racial discrimination, has set Christian against Christian and generated a regrettable lack of Christian charity among us all. Most of the discussions of this problem have been on the basis of Christian ethics and moral theology. Important as it is to understand the problem in these terms, however, a full Christian perspective cannot be achieved without also considering it in the light of divine providence. Loyalty to the biblical view of the nature of history involves not only viewing the course of events ethically in terms of what men in their freedom ought or ought not to do, but also, and equally, viewing it providentially in terms of what God in the exercise of his governance over his creation purposes for it. Admittedly, these two ways of viewing history involve us in the age-old paradox of freedom and predestination, but there is no way to remain biblical, and therefore truly Christian, without giving full weight to both. It is essential, therefore, to consider the whole problem of nuclear warfare in the context of God's providence and the reality of his Lordship over history, both in judgment and in redemption.

God's providence exercised through men

At the outset of any such discussion of this problem, it is necessary to dispose of one common source of misunderstanding. In my dual role as priest and scientist, I am frequently called upon to speak on the Christian view of nuclear warfare. Invariably when I do so, I am accused of being a fatalist and of advocating a policy of sitting back and merely letting things

never known one who was indifferent to the danger of a nuclear holocaust. I can testify that many of them endure an inner anguish, in dealing with these matters, that we others cannot know and that few of us, perhaps, could long bear.

The differences of view, in these cases, are not over the great objectives. They are not over whether a nuclear war would be a good thing or a bad thing. They are not over whether peace is, in itself, desirable or undesirable. The differences are, rather, over the ways and the means. They are over questions of how nuclear war may be averted, of how peace may be achieved. And here the decision-makers confront, more vividly than some of us others, the merciless discipline of the possible. The great political problems are not issues of right versus wrong. They are, rather, dilemmas bearing on ways and means. To the extent that they involve ethical considerations, they are dilemmas of casuistry.

Mr. Walter Lippmann has observed that we must distinguish between the wisdom of the spirit and the wisdom to solve the problems of worldly conduct. For the first is "the vision of a realm of being in which the problems of earthly existence are not solved but transcended". The remainder of this article addresses itself to its subject in terms of the problems of earthly existence, problems which are so much more intractable than any others.

* * *

The role of power in international society is the first fact with which we have to reckon. Power is compounded of material elements, like industrial strength and military effectiveness, and of cultural or moral elements, like vision and purpose. Perhaps the moral elements can in some degree compensate for deficiencies in the material elements, but they cannot obviate the need for them. Gandhi, who is commonly misreported on this point, advocated the tactic of non-violence to his fellow-countrymen only because the means of effective violence were all in the hands of their opponents. Where effective violence was possible, however, he was quite ready to advocate it, and did so, as in his "doctrine of the sword". We must, then, accept power as a given factor, whether we find it attractive or not.

Power in equilibrium

In this earthly existence, peace is intimately related to order, and order in turn requires a social equilibrium that represents a distribution and balance of power. The equilibrium is dynamic. This is to say that our several societies counter one another, press against one another with their power, in a more or less active way. Any abrupt change in this equilibrium threatens chaos, and chaos is the antithesis of peace. The decline of Turkish power in the nineteenth century was the cause of a series of wars, as the neighbouring powers were drawn, quite unavoidably, into the power-vacuum. The same was true of the decline of Chinese power from 1840 on.

This dependence on keeping power in equilibrium would remain even if we had an effective world government. It is not primarily because it is under one government that the United States enjoys peace and order within its confines. It is, rather, because its component communities act as checks and balances against one another — as, for example, in the case of labour and capital. The existence of a reasonably integrated society in a state of equilibrium makes possible the one government, which in turn contributes to the order over which it presides.

It follows that we shall not get world peace by abdicating our power — that is, by unilateral disarmament or by a general surrender. Chaos would surely ensue immediately, as the Soviet Union and China were drawn pell-mell into the power-vacuum that we had created. But even if we suppose that chaos would not ensue immediately, we may still doubt that the cause of peace would be advanced. When England and the United States and every other country were under communist rule, dissension among the communist governments would follow, and would be no less likely to lead to war than present dissensions. We should have paid a terrible price for peace without obtaining it. In fact, we should have lost the chance of peace. What would have happened would simply have been that we, who for the sake of peace had given up our power, no longer were able to influence the conduct of the affairs of the world,

which would remain in the hands of those who had not made the sacrifice of their power.

Peace through mutual tolerance

The international equilibrium, then, defines the limits of possibility. The problem of peace is the problem of its stabilization. Our objective must be to work for its stabilization.

The achievement of increasing stability involves an inextricable compound of psychological and political factors. One all-important psychological factor is the sense of security. If the powers on each side are convinced that the powers on the other have committed themselves to the enterprise of bringing about their destruction, then the arms race will be uncontrolled and desperate risks will be taken. This problem is not to be met by "educational" campaigns to persuade the people on one side that they should put their trust in the good intentions of the other; for the intentions of the other may, in fact, not merit such trust. The problem is to be met only by actual limitation of intentions all around, their confinement within the bounds set by mutual toleration. It is to be met only by the development of a situation in which each side clearly accepts the continuing existence of the other.

Beginning in the seventh century with the rise of Islam, neither the Christian nor the Moslem world was disposed to accept the existence of the other, and war raged between them. Today they accept each other's existence, and peace reigns between them. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, neither Catholics nor Protestants accepted each other's existence, and Europe was devastated by the consequent wars of religion. Today they do accept each other's existence, and so they no longer hunt each other down in the streets. Mutual tolerance is the tap-root from which peace grows.

In the years immediately after the Russian Revolution, the Western powers did not accept the continued existence of a Russian communist regime. Their expeditionary forces, however, were unsuccessful in putting it down, and so (because it proved itself as strong as it did) they came to accept its existence. This was proved, in a sense, during the decade

beginning in 1945 when the West refrained from using its nuclear monopoly, which it knew to be short lived, in order to put an end to the communists. I think I can state as absolute truth that, in spite of undoubted Russian fears to the contrary, the possibility of "preventive war" was never under consideration — that is, was never formally taken up for examination — by any Western government. The government in Washington, certainly, never contemplated it.

The United States began by not accepting the existence of the Chinese communist regime, and today it is still stuck with a formal non-recognition of its existence. But it has come, in fact, to accept its existence, and there is no longer any thought of a crusade to destroy it. Formal recognition becomes politically feasible.

The communist powers, on the other hand, are formally committed to an ideology that forbids them to rest from pursuing the objective of our destruction until that objective is achieved. They are committed to their own universal supremacy, as Islam was once committed to its universal supremacy.

Competition with limitations

I do not, however, make too much of this formal commitment. If the West remains strong, the unlimited objective will, in time, be renounced in action if not overtly in words. The zeal of the first generation will give way to the realism of its successors, though they continue to utter the accepted cant and pay the traditional lip-service. During the summer of 1960 an ideological quarrel was going on between the Russian communists and the Chinese communists, the central issue being that of "peaceful co-existence" with the non-communist world. Here is an issue that time will resolve, if there is enough time, in favour of co-existence. Its favourable resolution depends, however, on the quiet maintenance of Western strength.

The limitation of objectives, then, is fundamental to peace. Other limitations must follow. When the nations feel themselves more secure, because their existence is accepted by their opponents, they will be less frantically concerned to increase

the power and effectiveness of their armaments. They will be more inclined to accept arms control or some other form of stabilization. They will be more inclined to stabilize their relations with one another in terms of international law, international organization, international procedures, and good manners. They will continue to compete, as Catholics and Protestants have continued to compete, but within safe and civilized limitations.

It took centuries to complete this kind of gradual stabilization between Islam and Christendom, and again between Catholics and Protestants. Today, however, the pace is being forced by the existence of the weapons that threaten a general nuclear destruction as the alternative. Never before have international quarrels reached such a pitch of intensity without breaking out into war. This is the product of a restraint such as governments have not hitherto had such an incentive to practise. The outstanding exception, that of the Korean War, proves the rule. It was the product of miscalculation by the communists, it was kept limited, and it was brought to an end without victory on either side.

The necessity of adjustment and restraint

Even with the sobering effect of nuclear and other terrible weapons, even with the incentive to peace which they provide, "political action for peace" can look forward only to a gradual realization of its objective. (The psychological elements, for one thing, depend on the establishment of custom, which is the slow process of becoming accustomed.) And such action cannot look forward to finality, for constant change is inherent in the very nature of this earthly existence. Populations grow and expand, resources are developed or become exhausted, science changes the terms of human living, prophets or demagogues arise to stir the multitudes, new visions move men to wisdom or to folly. The changes impose the necessity of readjustments in international society — that is, of adjustments in the equilibrium. Peace will depend on not upsetting the equilibrium altogether by making these adjustments too abruptly and violently. It will depend on making them gradually and tactfully.

All this is an argument for sobriety and self-restraint by individuals and nations. It is an argument for tolerance, intellectual magnanimity, modesty, and patience. It is an argument against too much zeal, against impassioned politics. It is an argument against the politics of self-righteousness that brands as demons those whom it identifies as the opposition. It is an argument against the kind of thinking that would bring about a total solution of all our problems overnight by a slogan or a theory. It is, for all these reasons, an argument that is more practical than inspirational. By prudent and thoughtful political action in dealing with details on the day-to-day scene, the stability that is peace may at last steal upon us so gradually that we never note the time of its arrival.

Of one thing we may be sure : that, just as the Pharisees are not the ones for whom the Kingdom of Heaven is prepared, so those who go about the streets crying peace are not the real peace-makers.

**YOUNG MINISTERS
AND MISSIONARIES IN PASTORAL WORK**

are invited to participate in the

**THIRD ECUMENICAL PRIZE ESSAY
COMPETITION**

closing on

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1961

Theme : The Una Sancta and the Local Congregation

Full details from
Scholarship Secretary
World Council of Churches
17 route de Malagnou
Geneva, Switzerland

A Possible Alternative to Pacifism in the Nuclear Age

A. W. BUZZARD

I propose first to comment a little destructively on the case for pacifism, and then to suggest an alternative line of policy, which responsible Christian citizens might support in this nuclear age.

We must first remember that the pacifist case is not fundamentally affected by nuclear weapons. If they had never been invented, pacifists would still argue against any lethal weapons in any circumstances — even bows and arrows.

Nevertheless, pacifists are right in claiming that all war is evil and contrary to Christian teaching and purpose. We can at least all agree, therefore, that one Christian aim must be to prevent and abolish *all* war.

The questions at issue are :

- (1) How should we try to achieve this aim ?
- (2) Are there any other comparable evils to be considered ?

Now the pacifist's answer to these two questions seems to be :

- (1) Uphold and practise here and now the ideal of no killing, regardless of consequences.
- (2) There is no other comparable evil to be considered.

That is one interpretation of the Bible. But there is another possible interpretation, which seems to me to say simply :

- (1) Love, and do your best for, all your neighbours — even dying for them, if necessary.
- (2) There may be other evils comparable to killing and being killed — such as the denial of truth, of justice, or of freedom to pursue God's purpose.

Theologians the world over have, of course, been arguing these two opposing views for years. As yet, I personally am more inclined to agree with the non-pacifist view, but would not wish to be dogmatic, or final, on this difficult matter. Some of the reasons why I find the Christian pacifist view difficult to uphold are these.

Christian non-pacifism — domestic and national

Love for one's neighbour means, surely, doing all one can for all one's neighbours — that is to say, all other human beings in the world. If they are threatened, then a Christian seems to me to be morally bound to try to protect them if he can. This is what most of us would feel right if, for example, one's child were attacked by a thug or murderer. To shrink from this, allowing the innocent child to be hurt or killed, would surely be morally irresponsible.

Such thugs and murderers do exist, and it is because our policemen, and the rest of us, are *prepared* to resist them that we are not often faced with this situation. But we all live under the continuous protection of these policemen, who have to be prepared to kill, if necessary.

The policeman is faced here with a real dilemma. He must exercise responsibility for both his neighbour, the innocent victim, and his other neighbour, the misguided, or cruel, thug. Should he resist and, if necessary, kill the thug and, incidentally, risk his own life ; or should he allow the innocent child to be killed and, incidentally, save his own skin — at least for the moment ?

I find it difficult not to conclude that God would wish him to take the first choice, subject to a number of important qualifications, which I will go into later.

Moreover, there are two further important considerations :

- (1) So long as that thug or murderer saw clearly that the policeman was *prepared*, if necessary, to kill him, he would most probably be deterred, and he, the child, and the policeman would *not* be killed.

- (2) If the thug were allowed to get away with that crime, he would probably go on to threaten and kill others as well, this sort of behaviour would encourage other potential thugs to do the same, and anarchy and the law of the jungle would spread over the community.

These considerations have led not only to the idea of policemen but also to the principle of self-defence, a right which is based not upon the unchristian idea that I should live and the thug die, but upon the probable *deterrent* effect of my readiness to defend myself and the consequent prevention of this and further killing.

Christian non-pacifism — international

Now, extending this same principle from the domestic or national to the international field (where alas ! there is as yet no fully effective international police force), the same terrible dilemma exists.

If we see millions of our innocent neighbours in another country threatened with invasion, slavery, and murder, ought we to pass by on the other side, or be prepared, if necessary, to defend them — even if this might mean killing and being killed ? Which is the lesser of these two evils ?

If it is right and reasonable for policemen to be prepared to resist, and if necessary kill, thugs and murderers within countries nationally, why is it not right and reasonable for soldiers to do the same *between* countries internationally — in a clear case of “thuggery” or “murder” — within the limits adopted by policemen ?

I find it very hard to believe that, in this sinful world as we find it, God would not wish us to be prepared to kill and be killed (with important qualifications), particularly when the consequences, more often than not, would be that :

- (1) The aggressor would be deterred and thus *no-one* killed.
- (2) We would be spared the alternative of turning the world over to a lot of international thugs, who would then fight much more often among themselves, so that we

and our neighbours would, in the long run, suffer *both* slavery *and* more wars and killing than if we had been prepared to resist in the first instance.

Until, therefore, we can organize a world police force, controlled by a world government, which we must continue to strive for, it seems to me that the commandment of love for our neighbours places on our shoulders the moral responsibility of acting on behalf of that missing international police force, in order to preserve freedom, law, order, and justice — as *policemen* — no less, but no more.

This, briefly, seems to me to be the non-pacifist Christian attitude, and the only tenable attitude for Christians as an alternative to pacifism in the aim, common to pacifist and non-pacifist alike, of preventing and abolishing the evil of war.

Because of these arguments, I personally, as yet, come down on the side of the non-pacifists. But I think I might come down on the side of the pacifists if I thought that the Western Christian world as a whole was so imbued with the Christian spirit as to be able to resist and defeat the thugs and aggressors by spiritual and moral means alone. Alas, I fear we are not that strong spiritually.

But, quite apart from these "theoretical" arguments, the practical fact remains that, so far as we can see, there is virtually no prospect of any responsible Western government adopting the pacifist attitude as *state* policy. So even if one should decide on pacifism as a personal attitude, there seems to me no reason why one should not — at the same time — do all one can to see that our state policy for fighting, and preparations to fight, do not go beyond the basic principles of the international policemen.

A non-pacifist government policy for Christians

Let me now try to offer some constructive proposals for a policy which non-pacifist Christians might pursue, and which the personal pacifists might also consider supporting as a government policy, while remaining personal pacifists.

In the light of the continued and horrible threats of both communism and nuclear weapons, in what circumstances, with

what aims, with what means, and to what extent, is fighting right and necessary?

First, I suggest war should only be resorted to in order to uphold justice, for example, in defence against blatant aggression, or to remove some intolerable basic injustice after all other means have been tried to the limit. An important national strategic or economic interest is not, in itself, a good enough reason for resorting to war.

Secondly, once at war, the aim adopted must again only be that of restoring justice, and our conditions for a "cease-fire" and a return to negotiations must therefore be limited to this. We must, in fact, provide every possible opportunity for the enemy to see the error of his ways and change his mind. Never again must we demand unconditional surrender.

Thirdly, the methods we employ must similarly always be restrained and controlled within the limits of over-all justice. A Christian never ceases to have real responsibility for *all* his neighbours, those he is defending, those in the neutral countries, and even those in the "aggressing" enemy country, who must be deterred, resisted, and, if necessary, killed, not with hate and vengeance, but with genuine reluctance and sorrow. This means that the methods used should always be limited, so that the destruction wrought is kept to the minimum and always in *proportion* to the aim of upholding over-all justice. In practice, this means, of course, that the fighting should always be kept under reasonable control, and that we should hold on to the legal principles, built up over the ages, for reasonable *discrimination* to be observed as between combatants and civilians, and as between belligerent countries and neutrals. And it is, of course, the uncontrollable and indiscriminate nature of total war with H-bombs, killing and poisoning innocent civilians and neutrals who play no part in the war, which makes it quite different from any conventional war of the past.

Fourthly, if the destruction should spread to a degree which brings it out of proportion to the aim of upholding over-all justice, then one way or another the fighting should be brought to an end.

All this means, in fact, that it is only possible to justify aims and means in war similar to those adopted by the police-

man, but no more. And this means, among other things, that to be prepared to fight only to deter an aggressor from fighting is quite a different thing from *initiating* the fighting ; and to be prepared to use nuclear weapons only to deter an aggressor from using his is quite a different thing from being the *first* to use them.

Against the background of these policeman-like principles, what exactly ought we to do in the circumstances in which we find ourselves today, remembering that the aim is to uphold freedom, law, order, and justice, including the prevention — and, as soon as we can manage it, the abolition — of all war, and the ultimate establishment of a world police force ?

Conventional and nuclear capability

Now the crux of the problem lies in that last point. It is one thing to be the *first* to fight, or to be the *first* to use nuclear weapons, and quite another to be prepared to fight, or to possess nuclear weapons, merely to deter the thugs from starting a fight or starting to use nuclear weapons.

Until disarmament has gone a very long way indeed, the communists will possess nuclear weapons, and I submit that, meanwhile, for the West as a whole not to remain in possession of them, while the communists still do, would not only be inexpedient, but also morally irresponsible. For in a crisis, with, say, a local, limited, conventional conflict being waged, it would be placing an almost unfair temptation in the hands of the communist dictators, if *they* were able to reach for their nuclear weapons, in the knowledge that *we* had thrown ours away. This was a temptation which we were unable to resist at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. How likely would a communist dictator be to resist it ?

Exactly which countries among the Western Alliance should possess nuclear weapons is clearly another and more detailed question, requiring the balancing of many considerations. But let me say in passing that whether Britain was right or wrong to make her own H-bomb, she now has it ; and the best way to dissuade other countries from following suit seems now to be for her to offer to share control of it with America and France,

on condition that no further countries make their own independent H-bomb.

But the main point is that it is both expedient and right for the West as a whole at least to *possess* nuclear weapons, so long as the communists do, in order to prevent them ever using theirs.

What is both wrong and inexpedient is for the West to be content to remain in the position in which we have to be the *first* to use nuclear weapons, if there should be a conventional aggression, or a conventional conflict should just break out by miscalculation, or the action of some third party like Egypt or Israel. Owing to our inferiority in conventional forces, this is the position which we are in today, and which we must somehow get out of. We are like a policeman armed with nothing between a truncheon and a hand-grenade, being told to go into a room full of people and deal with a thug armed with a pistol. He either has to fail, or blow up the thug, himself, and everyone else.

To be content to remain in this situation would clearly be inconsistent with any moral or legal principles. It also leaves the world in a very *unstable* position. For if any serious East-West crisis should arise, the communists, knowing that we have to strike first and early with our nuclear weapons, would be sorely tempted to do so themselves, because of the tremendous advantage of getting in the first blow with such weapons.

What are we to do? If we want to escape from having to be the first to use nuclear weapons, clearly we either have to improve *our* conventional capability, or get the communists to reduce *theirs*, or do both these things.

It would, of course, be best to get the communists to reduce their conventional capability, but this means asking them to undertake a major measure of unilateral disarmament gratuitously, without our being able to offer anything comparable in return. The prospects of this in the early stages of disarmament are negligible. The first move must, therefore, be for us — the West as a whole — to improve our own conventional capability by our own unaided efforts, and this, of course, means spending more money on this aspect of defence.

Increased defence budgets

This, in turn, means either increasing our defence budgets or transferring money from our nuclear to our conventional weapons. Although there is certainly *some* scope for the latter in the case of the three Western countries which are spending money on both nuclear and conventional weapons, for various reasons this alone cannot now give the necessary impetus to the improvement of Western conventional forces as a whole in the first instance. Only an *addition* to Western defence budgets all round can now make the necessary impact on the shortcomings of our existing conventional equipment.

How much additional money is needed, and what would it achieve? Several unofficial estimates have been made in America and Britain by well-informed people, and it is clear that an all-round increase of as little as ten per cent in defence budgets would make a decisive difference in Western ability to deter or resist communist aggression, without having to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

But it would do more than this. A temporary additional expenditure of this order for a few years would do much, too, to help progress in both "disarmament" and "interdependence"¹. In "interdependence", the more we rely on conventional weapons, the more we can rely on Allies going to each other's assistance if threatened, and the less the need, therefore, for us all to have our own independent nuclear and other weapons. This would save money and thus make more available for still further improving our conventional capability, and so on.

Similarly, in "disarmament" the more we rely on conventional weapons the more we can afford to agree to restrictions on nuclear arms, and the more likely are the communists to agree to restrictions on conventional forces. Again money would be saved and so make more available for still further improving our conventional equipment, and so on.

The extent to which we would succeed in all this could not, of course, be guaranteed in advance. But it is at least certain that every improvement in our conventional capability would :

¹ Our ability to share defence expenses within the Western Alliance.

- (1) Make us less likely to have to threaten or use nuclear weapons first.
- (2) Make us more likely to gain progress in disarmament and interdependence, wherein lie the only possible means of relief from the ever-increasing cost of armaments.

Moreover, *only* when we have improved our conventional capability are these things likely to happen.

It is just money to improve the equipment and mobility of our conventional forces which is mainly needed. Little additional manpower is necessary, though its training, and the readiness of our reserves, should be improved, and this, too, costs money.

Can the West afford this additional ten per cent on defence budgets, for the few years needed to get this process started? "Of course we can, if we want to", is the sort of answer one almost invariably gets from economic experts. They point out, too, that we could find the money without sacrificing the essential needs of either our own social services or our aid to underdeveloped countries. We could, and must, find it out of our own personal pockets which — as a percentage of our gross national product — are steadily expanding, whereas the percentage being devoted to defence is steadily decreasing.

Alternatively, we could all work a little bit harder. But to do this, or to restrict the expansion of our personal pockets, is, of course, unpopular; and unpopular measures in democracies are too often considered politically "undesirable". Indeed, they are sometimes called "impracticable", which they are, unless the issues are put clearly before the public with fearless leadership. It is just this which is now needed, and the issue is quite simple.

Are we, or aren't we — in the West as a whole — prepared to make the small financial sacrifice all round needed to escape from our morally intolerable, and militarily unstable, position of having to defend freedom and justice by being the first to use nuclear weapons?

The Christian answer is, surely, clear — certainly for non-pacifists, and possibly for personal pacifists, too.

The Christian Peace Conference

JOSEF L. HROMADKA

We who are responsible for the Christian Peace Conference are constantly being questioned about its significance and objectives : Does it not unnecessarily complicate the ecumenical situation ? Can it really help towards solving today's problems ? It would be wrong, as well as short-sighted, to ignore these questions, and to brush aside the doubts frequently expressed about our intentions. We ourselves never cease to reflect on what we have already done and on our future activities, and we want to overcome all sincere hesitations as well as all prejudice and suspicion, but to do so in the right way. In all humility we must face the fact that many of our brethren throughout the world are critical and wary of us, and sometimes even opposed to us. When we meet with prejudice and suspicion, we must do our best to listen to the critical voices, the warnings and contradictions, without any prejudice or suspicion on our own part, and to try to confute them frankly, but with a readiness to learn. The international atmosphere is tense, and in the present situation we must strive patiently, with goodwill and an open mind, to prevent the gradual worsening of the danger in which we find ourselves ; we must overcome it with courage and contrition. It is not enough simply to make clear our own intentions and determination. From day to day we must be prepared to stand before our brethren and adopt new ways and new words for the sake of a better, a freer, atmosphere. It would be a catastrophe if we were to succumb to ill-will and were no longer able to speak with our fellow Christians or even with our fellow human beings without becoming irritated.

Our decision to organize a Christian Peace Conference, and if possible an All-Christian Peace Assembly, goes back to the end of 1957. It was one of those moments when there was a particularly strong urge to make a fresh start : just after the events in Hungary and the Suez crisis. The world was in a state of great anxiety over the beginnings of the irrepressible

never known one who was indifferent to the danger of a nuclear holocaust. I can testify that many of them endure an inner anguish, in dealing with these matters, that we others cannot know and that few of us, perhaps, could long bear.

The differences of view, in these cases, are not over the great objectives. They are not over whether a nuclear war would be a good thing or a bad thing. They are not over whether peace is, in itself, desirable or undesirable. The differences are, rather, over the ways and the means. They are over questions of how nuclear war may be averted, of how peace may be achieved. And here the decision-makers confront, more vividly than some of us others, the merciless discipline of the possible. The great political problems are not issues of right versus wrong. They are, rather, dilemmas bearing on ways and means. To the extent that they involve ethical considerations, they are dilemmas of casuistry.

Mr. Walter Lippmann has observed that we must distinguish between the wisdom of the spirit and the wisdom to solve the problems of worldly conduct. For the first is "the vision of a realm of being in which the problems of earthly existence are not solved but transcended". The remainder of this article addresses itself to its subject in terms of the problems of earthly existence, problems which are so much more intractable than any others.

* * *

The role of power in international society is the first fact with which we have to reckon. Power is compounded of material elements, like industrial strength and military effectiveness, and of cultural or moral elements, like vision and purpose. Perhaps the moral elements can in some degree compensate for deficiencies in the material elements, but they cannot obviate the need for them. Gandhi, who is commonly misreported on this point, advocated the tactic of non-violence to his fellow-countrymen only because the means of effective violence were all in the hands of their opponents. Where effective violence was possible, however, he was quite ready to advocate it, and did so, as in his "doctrine of the sword". We must, then, accept power as a given factor, whether we find it attractive or not.

Power in equilibrium

In this earthly existence, peace is intimately related to order, and order in turn requires a social equilibrium that represents a distribution and balance of power. The equilibrium is dynamic. This is to say that our several societies counter one another, press against one another with their power, in a more or less active way. Any abrupt change in this equilibrium threatens chaos, and chaos is the antithesis of peace. The decline of Turkish power in the nineteenth century was the cause of a series of wars, as the neighbouring powers were drawn, quite unavoidably, into the power-vacuum. The same was true of the decline of Chinese power from 1840 on.

This dependence on keeping power in equilibrium would remain even if we had an effective world government. It is not primarily because it is under one government that the United States enjoys peace and order within its confines. It is, rather, because its component communities act as checks and balances against one another — as, for example, in the case of labour and capital. The existence of a reasonably integrated society in a state of equilibrium makes possible the one government, which in turn contributes to the order over which it presides.

It follows that we shall not get world peace by abdicating our power — that is, by unilateral disarmament or by a general surrender. Chaos would surely ensue immediately, as the Soviet Union and China were drawn pell-mell into the power-vacuum that we had created. But even if we suppose that chaos would not ensue immediately, we may still doubt that the cause of peace would be advanced. When England and the United States and every other country were under communist rule, dissension among the communist governments would follow, and would be no less likely to lead to war than present dissensions. We should have paid a terrible price for peace without obtaining it. In fact, we should have lost the chance of peace. What would have happened would simply have been that we, who for the sake of peace had given up our power, no longer were able to influence the conduct of the affairs of the world,

which would remain in the hands of those who had not made the sacrifice of their power.

Peace through mutual tolerance

The international equilibrium, then, defines the limits of possibility. The problem of peace is the problem of its stabilization. Our objective must be to work for its stabilization.

The achievement of increasing stability involves an inextricable compound of psychological and political factors. One all-important psychological factor is the sense of security. If the powers on each side are convinced that the powers on the other have committed themselves to the enterprise of bringing about their destruction, then the arms race will be uncontrolled and desperate risks will be taken. This problem is not to be met by "educational" campaigns to persuade the people on one side that they should put their trust in the good intentions of the other; for the intentions of the other may, in fact, not merit such trust. The problem is to be met only by actual limitation of intentions all around, their confinement within the bounds set by mutual toleration. It is to be met only by the development of a situation in which each side clearly accepts the continuing existence of the other.

Beginning in the seventh century with the rise of Islam, neither the Christian nor the Moslem world was disposed to accept the existence of the other, and war raged between them. Today they accept each other's existence, and peace reigns between them. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, neither Catholics nor Protestants accepted each other's existence, and Europe was devastated by the consequent wars of religion. Today they do accept each other's existence, and so they no longer hunt each other down in the streets. Mutual tolerance is the tap-root from which peace grows.

In the years immediately after the Russian Revolution, the Western powers did not accept the continued existence of a Russian communist regime. Their expeditionary forces, however, were unsuccessful in putting it down, and so (because it proved itself as strong as it did) they came to accept its existence. This was proved, in a sense, during the decade

beginning in 1945 when the West refrained from using its nuclear monopoly, which it knew to be short lived, in order to put an end to the communists. I think I can state as absolute truth that, in spite of undoubted Russian fears to the contrary, the possibility of "preventive war" was never under consideration — that is, was never formally taken up for examination — by any Western government. The government in Washington, certainly, never contemplated it.

The United States began by not accepting the existence of the Chinese communist regime, and today it is still stuck with a formal non-recognition of its existence. But it has come, in fact, to accept its existence, and there is no longer any thought of a crusade to destroy it. Formal recognition becomes politically feasible.

The communist powers, on the other hand, are formally committed to an ideology that forbids them to rest from pursuing the objective of our destruction until that objective is achieved. They are committed to their own universal supremacy, as Islam was once committed to its universal supremacy.

Competition with limitations

I do not, however, make too much of this formal commitment. If the West remains strong, the unlimited objective will, in time, be renounced in action if not overtly in words. The zeal of the first generation will give way to the realism of its successors, though they continue to utter the accepted cant and pay the traditional lip-service. During the summer of 1960 an ideological quarrel was going on between the Russian communists and the Chinese communists, the central issue being that of "peaceful co-existence" with the non-communist world. Here is an issue that time will resolve, if there is enough time, in favour of co-existence. Its favourable resolution depends, however, on the quiet maintenance of Western strength.

The limitation of objectives, then, is fundamental to peace. Other limitations must follow. When the nations feel themselves more secure, because their existence is accepted by their opponents, they will be less frantically concerned to increase

the power and effectiveness of their armaments. They will be more inclined to accept arms control or some other form of stabilization. They will be more inclined to stabilize their relations with one another in terms of international law, international organization, international procedures, and good manners. They will continue to compete, as Catholics and Protestants have continued to compete, but within safe and civilized limitations.

It took centuries to complete this kind of gradual stabilization between Islam and Christendom, and again between Catholics and Protestants. Today, however, the pace is being forced by the existence of the weapons that threaten a general nuclear destruction as the alternative. Never before have international quarrels reached such a pitch of intensity without breaking out into war. This is the product of a restraint such as governments have not hitherto had such an incentive to practise. The outstanding exception, that of the Korean War, proves the rule. It was the product of miscalculation by the communists, it was kept limited, and it was brought to an end without victory on either side.

The necessity of adjustment and restraint

Even with the sobering effect of nuclear and other terrible weapons, even with the incentive to peace which they provide, "political action for peace" can look forward only to a gradual realization of its objective. (The psychological elements, for one thing, depend on the establishment of custom, which is the slow process of becoming accustomed.) And such action cannot look forward to finality, for constant change is inherent in the very nature of this earthly existence. Populations grow and expand, resources are developed or become exhausted, science changes the terms of human living, prophets or demagogues arise to stir the multitudes, new visions move men to wisdom or to folly. The changes impose the necessity of readjustments in international society — that is, of adjustments in the equilibrium. Peace will depend on not upsetting the equilibrium altogether by making these adjustments too abruptly and violently. It will depend on making them gradually and tactfully.

All this is an argument for sobriety and self-restraint by individuals and nations. It is an argument for tolerance, intellectual magnanimity, modesty, and patience. It is an argument against too much zeal, against impassioned politics. It is an argument against the politics of self-righteousness that brands as demons those whom it identifies as the opposition. It is an argument against the kind of thinking that would bring about a total solution of all our problems overnight by a slogan or a theory. It is, for all these reasons, an argument that is more practical than inspirational. By prudent and thoughtful political action in dealing with details on the day-to-day scene, the stability that is peace may at last steal upon us so gradually that we never note the time of its arrival.

Of one thing we may be sure : that, just as the Pharisees are not the ones for whom the Kingdom of Heaven is prepared, so those who go about the streets crying peace are not the real peace-makers.

**YOUNG MINISTERS
AND MISSIONARIES IN PASTORAL WORK**

are invited to participate in the

**THIRD ECUMENICAL PRIZE ESSAY
COMPETITION**

closing on

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1961

Theme : The Una Sancta and the Local Congregation

Full details from
Scholarship Secretary
World Council of Churches
17 route de Malagnou
Geneva, Switzerland

A Possible Alternative to Pacifism in the Nuclear Age

A. W. BUZZARD

I propose first to comment a little destructively on the case for pacifism, and then to suggest an alternative line of policy, which responsible Christian citizens might support in this nuclear age.

We must first remember that the pacifist case is not fundamentally affected by nuclear weapons. If they had never been invented, pacifists would still argue against any lethal weapons in any circumstances — even bows and arrows.

Nevertheless, pacifists are right in claiming that all war is evil and contrary to Christian teaching and purpose. We can at least all agree, therefore, that one Christian aim must be to prevent and abolish *all* war.

The questions at issue are :

- (1) How should we try to achieve this aim ?
- (2) Are there any other comparable evils to be considered ?

Now the pacifist's answer to these two questions seems to be :

- (1) Uphold and practise here and now the ideal of no killing, regardless of consequences.
- (2) There is no other comparable evil to be considered.

That is one interpretation of the Bible. But there is another possible interpretation, which seems to me to say simply :

- (1) Love, and do your best for, all your neighbours — even dying for them, if necessary.
- (2) There may be other evils comparable to killing and being killed — such as the denial of truth, of justice, or of freedom to pursue God's purpose.

Theologians the world over have, of course, been arguing these two opposing views for years. As yet, I personally am more inclined to agree with the non-pacifist view, but would not wish to be dogmatic, or final, on this difficult matter. Some of the reasons why I find the Christian pacifist view difficult to uphold are these.

Christian non-pacifism — domestic and national

Love for one's neighbour means, surely, doing all one can for all one's neighbours — that is to say, all other human beings in the world. If they are threatened, then a Christian seems to me to be morally bound to try to protect them if he can. This is what most of us would feel right if, for example, one's child were attacked by a thug or murderer. To shrink from this, allowing the innocent child to be hurt or killed, would surely be morally irresponsible.

Such thugs and murderers do exist, and it is because our policemen, and the rest of us, are *prepared* to resist them that we are not often faced with this situation. But we all live under the continuous protection of these policemen, who have to be prepared to kill, if necessary.

The policeman is faced here with a real dilemma. He must exercise responsibility for both his neighbour, the innocent victim, and his other neighbour, the misguided, or cruel, thug. Should he resist and, if necessary, kill the thug and, incidentally, risk his own life ; or should he allow the innocent child to be killed and, incidentally, save his own skin — at least for the moment ?

I find it difficult not to conclude that God would wish him to take the first choice, subject to a number of important qualifications, which I will go into later.

Moreover, there are two further important considerations :

- (1) So long as that thug or murderer saw clearly that the policeman was *prepared*, if necessary, to kill him, he would most probably be deterred, and he, the child, and the policeman would *not* be killed.

- (2) If the thug were allowed to get away with that crime, he would probably go on to threaten and kill others as well, this sort of behaviour would encourage other potential thugs to do the same, and anarchy and the law of the jungle would spread over the community.

These considerations have led not only to the idea of policemen but also to the principle of self-defence, a right which is based not upon the unchristian idea that I should live and the thug die, but upon the probable *deterrent* effect of my readiness to defend myself and the consequent prevention of this and further killing.

Christian non-pacifism — international

Now, extending this same principle from the domestic or national to the international field (where alas! there is as yet no fully effective international police force), the same terrible dilemma exists.

If we see millions of our innocent neighbours in another country threatened with invasion, slavery, and murder, ought we to pass by on the other side, or be prepared, if necessary, to defend them — even if this might mean killing and being killed? Which is the lesser of these two evils?

If it is right and reasonable for policemen to be prepared to resist, and if necessary kill, thugs and murderers within countries nationally, why is it not right and reasonable for soldiers to do the same *between* countries internationally — in a clear case of “thuggery” or “murder” — within the limits adopted by policemen?

I find it very hard to believe that, in this sinful world as we find it, God would not wish us to be prepared to kill and be killed (with important qualifications), particularly when the consequences, more often than not, would be that:

- (1) The aggressor would be deterred and thus *no-one* killed.
- (2) We would be spared the alternative of turning the world over to a lot of international thugs, who would then fight much more often among themselves, so that we

and our neighbours would, in the long run, suffer *both* slavery *and* more wars and killing than if we had been prepared to resist in the first instance.

Until, therefore, we can organize a world police force, controlled by a world government, which we must continue to strive for, it seems to me that the commandment of love for our neighbours places on our shoulders the moral responsibility of acting on behalf of that missing international police force, in order to preserve freedom, law, order, and justice — as *policemen* — no less, but no more.

This, briefly, seems to me to be the non-pacifist Christian attitude, and the only tenable attitude for Christians as an alternative to pacifism in the aim, common to pacifist and non-pacifist alike, of preventing and abolishing the evil of war.

Because of these arguments, I personally, as yet, come down on the side of the non-pacifists. But I think I might come down on the side of the pacifists if I thought that the Western Christian world as a whole was so imbued with the Christian spirit as to be able to resist and defeat the thugs and aggressors by spiritual and moral means alone. Alas, I fear we are not that strong spiritually.

But, quite apart from these “theoretical” arguments, the practical fact remains that, so far as we can see, there is virtually no prospect of any responsible Western government adopting the pacifist attitude as *state* policy. So even if one should decide on pacifism as a personal attitude, there seems to me no reason why one should not — at the same time — do all one can to see that our state policy for fighting, and preparations to fight, do not go beyond the basic principles of the international policemen.

A non-pacifist government policy for Christians

Let me now try to offer some constructive proposals for a policy which non-pacifist Christians might pursue, and which the personal pacifists might also consider supporting as a government policy, while remaining personal pacifists.

In the light of the continued and horrible threats of both communism and nuclear weapons, in what circumstances, with

what aims, with what means, and to what extent, is fighting right and necessary?

First, I suggest war should only be resorted to in order to uphold justice, for example, in defence against blatant aggression, or to remove some intolerable basic injustice after all other means have been tried to the limit. An important national strategic or economic interest is not, in itself, a good enough reason for resorting to war.

Secondly, once at war, the aim adopted must again only be that of restoring justice, and our conditions for a "cease-fire" and a return to negotiations must therefore be limited to this. We must, in fact, provide every possible opportunity for the enemy to see the error of his ways and change his mind. Never again must we demand unconditional surrender.

Thirdly, the methods we employ must similarly always be restrained and controlled within the limits of over-all justice. A Christian never ceases to have real responsibility for *all* his neighbours, those he is defending, those in the neutral countries, and even those in the "aggressing" enemy country, who must be deterred, resisted, and, if necessary, killed, not with hate and vengeance, but with genuine reluctance and sorrow. This means that the methods used should always be limited, so that the destruction wrought is kept to the minimum and always in *proportion* to the aim of upholding over-all justice. In practice, this means, of course, that the fighting should always be kept under reasonable control, and that we should hold on to the legal principles, built up over the ages, for reasonable *discrimination* to be observed as between combatants and civilians, and as between belligerent countries and neutrals. And it is, of course, the uncontrollable and indiscriminate nature of total war with H-bombs, killing and poisoning innocent civilians and neutrals who play no part in the war, which makes it quite different from any conventional war of the past.

Fourthly, if the destruction should spread to a degree which brings it out of proportion to the aim of upholding over-all justice, then one way or another the fighting should be brought to an end.

All this means, in fact, that it is only possible to justify aims and means in war similar to those adopted by the police-

man, but no more. And this means, among other things, that to be prepared to fight only to deter an aggressor from fighting is quite a different thing from *initiating* the fighting ; and to be prepared to use nuclear weapons only to deter an aggressor from using his is quite a different thing from being the *first* to use them.

Against the background of these policeman-like principles, what exactly ought we to do in the circumstances in which we find ourselves today, remembering that the aim is to uphold freedom, law, order, and justice, including the prevention — and, as soon as we can manage it, the abolition — of all war, and the ultimate establishment of a world police force ?

Conventional and nuclear capability

Now the crux of the problem lies in that last point. It is one thing to be the *first* to fight, or to be the *first* to use nuclear weapons, and quite another to be prepared to fight, or to possess nuclear weapons, merely to deter the thugs from starting a fight or starting to use nuclear weapons.

Until disarmament has gone a very long way indeed, the communists will possess nuclear weapons, and I submit that, meanwhile, for the West as a whole not to remain in possession of them, while the communists still do, would not only be inexpedient, but also morally irresponsible. For in a crisis, with, say, a local, limited, conventional conflict being waged, it would be placing an almost unfair temptation in the hands of the communist dictators, if *they* were able to reach for their nuclear weapons, in the knowledge that *we* had thrown ours away. This was a temptation which we were unable to resist at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. How likely would a communist dictator be to resist it ?

Exactly which countries among the Western Alliance should possess nuclear weapons is clearly another and more detailed question, requiring the balancing of many considerations. But let me say in passing that whether Britain was right or wrong to make her own H-bomb, she now has it ; and the best way to dissuade other countries from following suit seems now to be for her to offer to share control of it with America and France,

on condition that no further countries make their own independent H-bomb.

But the main point is that it is both expedient and right for the West as a whole at least to *possess* nuclear weapons, so long as the communists do, in order to prevent them ever using theirs.

What is both wrong and inexpedient is for the West to be content to remain in the position in which we have to be the *first* to use nuclear weapons, if there should be a conventional aggression, or a conventional conflict should just break out by miscalculation, or the action of some third party like Egypt or Israel. Owing to our inferiority in conventional forces, this is the position which we are in today, and which we must somehow get out of. We are like a policeman armed with nothing between a truncheon and a hand-grenade, being told to go into a room full of people and deal with a thug armed with a pistol. He either has to fail, or blow up the thug, himself, and everyone else.

To be content to remain in this situation would clearly be inconsistent with any moral or legal principles. It also leaves the world in a very *unstable* position. For if any serious East-West crisis should arise, the communists, knowing that we have to strike first and early with our nuclear weapons, would be sorely tempted to do so themselves, because of the tremendous advantage of getting in the first blow with such weapons.

What are we to do? If we want to escape from having to be the first to use nuclear weapons, clearly we either have to improve *our* conventional capability, or get the communists to reduce *theirs*, or do both these things.

It would, of course, be best to get the communists to reduce their conventional capability, but this means asking them to undertake a major measure of unilateral disarmament gratuitously, without our being able to offer anything comparable in return. The prospects of this in the early stages of disarmament are negligible. The first move must, therefore, be for us — the West as a whole — to improve our own conventional capability by our own unaided efforts, and this, of course, means spending more money on this aspect of defence.

Increased defence budgets

This, in turn, means either increasing our defence budgets or transferring money from our nuclear to our conventional weapons. Although there is certainly *some* scope for the latter in the case of the three Western countries which are spending money on both nuclear and conventional weapons, for various reasons this alone cannot now give the necessary impetus to the improvement of Western conventional forces as a whole in the first instance. Only an *addition* to Western defence budgets all round can now make the necessary impact on the shortcomings of our existing conventional equipment.

How much additional money is needed, and what would it achieve? Several unofficial estimates have been made in America and Britain by well-informed people, and it is clear that an all-round increase of as little as ten per cent in defence budgets would make a decisive difference in Western ability to deter or resist communist aggression, without having to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

But it would do more than this. A temporary additional expenditure of this order for a few years would do much, too, to help progress in both "disarmament" and "interdependence"¹. In "interdependence", the more we rely on conventional weapons, the more we can rely on Allies going to each other's assistance if threatened, and the less the need, therefore, for us all to have our own independent nuclear and other weapons. This would save money and thus make more available for still further improving our conventional capability, and so on.

Similarly, in "disarmament" the more we rely on conventional weapons the more we can afford to agree to restrictions on nuclear arms, and the more likely are the communists to agree to restrictions on conventional forces. Again money would be saved and so make more available for still further improving our conventional equipment, and so on.

The extent to which we would succeed in all this could not, of course, be guaranteed in advance. But it is at least certain that every improvement in our conventional capability would :

¹ Our ability to share defence expenses within the Western Alliance.

- (1) Make us less likely to have to threaten or use nuclear weapons first.
- (2) Make us more likely to gain progress in disarmament and interdependence, wherein lie the only possible means of relief from the ever-increasing cost of armaments.

Moreover, *only* when we have improved our conventional capability are these things likely to happen.

It is just money to improve the equipment and mobility of our conventional forces which is mainly needed. Little additional manpower is necessary, though its training, and the readiness of our reserves, should be improved, and this, too, costs money.

Can the West afford this additional ten per cent on defence budgets, for the few years needed to get this process started? "Of course we can, if we want to", is the sort of answer one almost invariably gets from economic experts. They point out, too, that we could find the money without sacrificing the essential needs of either our own social services or our aid to under-developed countries. We could, and must, find it out of our own personal pockets which — as a percentage of our gross national product — are steadily expanding, whereas the percentage being devoted to defence is steadily decreasing.

Alternatively, we could all work a little bit harder. But to do this, or to restrict the expansion of our personal pockets, is, of course, unpopular; and unpopular measures in democracies are too often considered politically "undesirable". Indeed, they are sometimes called "impracticable", which they are, unless the issues are put clearly before the public with fearless leadership. It is just this which is now needed, and the issue is quite simple.

Are we, or aren't we — in the West as a whole — prepared to make the small financial sacrifice all round needed to escape from our morally intolerable, and militarily unstable, position of having to defend freedom and justice by being the first to use nuclear weapons?

The Christian answer is, surely, clear — certainly for non-pacifists, and possibly for personal pacifists, too.

The Christian Peace Conference

JOSEF L. HROMADKA

We who are responsible for the Christian Peace Conference are constantly being questioned about its significance and objectives : Does it not unnecessarily complicate the ecumenical situation ? Can it really help towards solving today's problems ? It would be wrong, as well as short-sighted, to ignore these questions, and to brush aside the doubts frequently expressed about our intentions. We ourselves never cease to reflect on what we have already done and on our future activities, and we want to overcome all sincere hesitations as well as all prejudice and suspicion, but to do so in the right way. In all humility we must face the fact that many of our brethren throughout the world are critical and wary of us, and sometimes even opposed to us. When we meet with prejudice and suspicion, we must do our best to listen to the critical voices, the warnings and contradictions, without any prejudice or suspicion on our own part, and to try to confute them frankly, but with a readiness to learn. The international atmosphere is tense, and in the present situation we must strive patiently, with goodwill and an open mind, to prevent the gradual worsening of the danger in which we find ourselves ; we must overcome it with courage and contrition. It is not enough simply to make clear our own intentions and determination. From day to day we must be prepared to stand before our brethren and adopt new ways and new words for the sake of a better, a freer, atmosphere. It would be a catastrophe if we were to succumb to ill-will and were no longer able to speak with our fellow Christians or even with our fellow human beings without becoming irritated.

Our decision to organize a Christian Peace Conference, and if possible an All-Christian Peace Assembly, goes back to the end of 1957. It was one of those moments when there was a particularly strong urge to make a fresh start : just after the events in Hungary and the Suez crisis. The world was in a state of great anxiety over the beginnings of the irrepressible

upsurge of the African peoples. It was clearly seen that the aftermath of the Second World War could be brought to an end without chaos and a new catastrophe, and that a new world was in the making, a world of peoples who were liberating themselves. The time seemed ripe to risk mobilizing the Christian forces of peace and to put them at the service of "man in revolution".

We should not want to deny that important steps have been made towards peace and the reconciliation of peoples through the ecumenical movement. Those who read attentively the documents concerning ecumenical meetings and discussions can find and evaluate the many declarations and resolutions about the bridging of the gap between peoples and particularly about the abolition of weapons of mass destruction. There is a constant outcry against the danger inherent in the present tension between the world powers. We can understand the objections which are voiced against our Peace Conference. We too are struggling against unnecessary duplication of ecumenical enterprises and against everything which might prove a burden to Christianity. We are ready to listen to all criticism, and we take our membership in the ecumenical family very seriously. A number of us have been loyal to the World Council of Churches since its very first beginnings, and participate actively in the work of the churches in their present tasks, and we are determined to continue to do so in the future. Several times we have witnessed to this resolution and demonstrated it in practical terms. Those who have been present at sessions of our Conference will confirm this. We are aware, however, that we have not yet succeeded in dispelling suspicion, disapproval, and reservations on the part of many of our brethren. For this reason I should like once again to clarify the motives and reasons for our activities.

An effort to break the stalemate through discussion

We note with deep concern that the gap between hostile nations and between their churches is today wider than it was two or three years ago. In the years immediately after the first Assembly of the World Council of Churches the atmosphere of the gulf in which we worked together was certainly

torrid but not sticky. We still possessed an inner vitality and fought each other energetically, but in the hope that something would be gained through our battles. Today we are more despondent and reserved. In spite of all our politeness and friendliness, we do not come too close together. An atmosphere of official, pious brotherliness has grown up, which does not close but only hides the gulf between us, and which prevents a real, direct, and frank dialogue. We must all take the blame. In this climate of caution, uncertainty, and fear we are afraid that a careless word may sever the ties which still bind us. We have reached an inner stalemate, and our words have lost their original fervour and also their weight. Sometimes it seems as if we do not expect anything from one another. Some years ago the old world of a nominally Christian civilization still hoped that the new socialist world arising was only an experiment and would sooner or later disintegrate, and that the churches there, which were existing but in hibernation, more or less sullied or compromised, would return to the old Christian family. Today this possibility is no longer considered. But the majority of Christians in the old world are not prepared to grasp, to appreciate, and to take seriously this new reality. They stand perplexed on the frontier between the old and the new world. Ten or fifteen years of cold war have permeated and moulded us to a greater extent than we like to admit. In the ecumenical family the cold war is not a favourite subject for discussion : thus far it has hardly been mentioned in conferences. It is a forbidden word, although it is constantly and earnestly discussed by both — or all — sides in power politics. Dialogue has become extremely difficult, since the same words are used but with different meanings. There are even Christians (and a vast number of them) who simply cannot imagine that on the other side, behind the so-called iron curtain, there are still real, living, and sincere Christians. And yet when these Christians from the other side make their voices heard, either they are not believed or they are treated with suspicion.

Can we remain in this distressing situation and become resigned to it ? Definitely not. And this is one of the reasons for our Christian work for peace. We should not remain immobile and rest content with this stalemate. Let us try to discuss

together, the ultimate questions of faith and the Church — and of mankind and the world. When you speak of peace with freedom and justice, what do you mean by freedom and justice? Is your understanding of these conceptions — or mine — evangelical and biblical, or is it anchored in an old tradition, no longer living and operative? You say that truth should dominate history and that we should not simply come to terms with an “historical situation”. But in the name of what truth are you (or am I) speaking? Are you yourself not so deeply immersed in an historical situation that you are completely unable to see how you have been absorbed by your own history? And what is truth? In the name of what truth are you questioning *our* right to take in earnest our actual historical reality? We can, unconsciously, take for granted an historical phenomenon and at the same time deny the right of others to wrestle as Christians with a new historical reality. Christendom today, in all its forms, is, much more than it imagines, historically determined and shaped by the political and cultural development of its peoples throughout history. There were Christians who took the historically evolved fact of monarchy or empire as a matter of course and did not ask themselves if, in the light of faith, it was legitimate to accept such an historical situation. There are churches in many lands which have taken Western democracy, an historical process, created by revolution, as the natural context for their activities, and who have also taken their understanding of freedom, equality, and justice, not from the Word of God but, all unsuspecting, from particular political ideologies and state images. Why then should we suddenly be denied the right to accept the new historical reality and the context created by a socialist revolution and, as Christians, to struggle with it, critically but in an affirmative and creative mood? Unfortunately we have not concerned ourselves about this last problem. We have not yet made a fresh attempt to discuss together under the sovereignty of faith our differences and divergences, and to prepare for a new era in the history of mankind, without illusions, day-dreams, or unwarranted optimism, but also without hardened hearts and cowardice, in a spirit of love and hope which anticipates new miracles and new victories.

An effort of rapprochement between churches East and West

Our work began as an experiment, and it remains so. This determines its nature and its significance, and also its outward form. We may be accused of inconsistency. Once we relied on the assistance and co-operation of official church leaders. The Eastern European churches had their official representatives, but the rest had none, although a number of well-known church dignitaries were present. Various working groups were a tremendous help to us. In addition, we relied, and always shall, on individuals who contribute their own intellectual powers to the work and without whom our future activities would be inconceivable. In its organization the Christian Peace Conference is a peculiar, inconsistent creation. We are not a church organization with official representatives. We rejoice when any church decides to support us through its delegates, but our working community (and it will remain a working community — a *communio viatorum*) remains open to all sides, and welcomes gladly every outsider who may be isolated in his own church but who can greatly assist the Church of Jesus Christ and world peace. The last session of our Peace Conference demonstrated this fact with a force not to be underestimated.

The friends who took part in this third session will agree with me when I say that the Christian Peace Conference offers a unique opportunity to come into contact with the Eastern European churches. More than twenty of them were officially represented in Prague. When we realize that seven Orthodox Churches were represented by official delegates (including such dignitaries as the Patriarch of the Grusinian Church, the Metropolitan of Leningrad, an Archbishop from Roumania, a Metropolitan from Bulgaria, the Metropolitan of Prague, etc.) we can speak of the significance of the Christian Peace Conference in church history. Orthodox, Lutherans, Reformed, Old Catholics, Baptists, Methodists, Moravians from Eastern Europe stretch out their hands and plead for help, support, and co-operation in a mighty struggle, not only for outward peace, for disarmament, and the abolition of weapons of mass destruction, but also for the reconciliation of peoples, for a genuine dialogue on the most important problems and tasks of mankind

today, for spiritually sure foundations to sustain us, for a new order for all men. Should these outstretched hands be ignored ? Should this community of churches be accused of one-sided political propaganda ? Is it justifiable to analyse and condemn their words, propositions, and actions with *a priori* mistrust and suspicion ? Certainly we Eastern European Christians see various problems differently from the average Christian in the West. Most of us represent a very definite point of view on international co-operation with the People's Republic of China, immediate disarmament under international control, military blocs, etc. However, is it right and just, from the very beginning, to reject as mere propaganda our viewpoint and propositions, without studying them objectively, and on the basis of their content, evaluating them, and then accepting or rejecting them only after thorough discussion and for good reasons ?

How thankful we are for our friends in Western countries who have the courage to take us seriously, to join in our struggle, and to assist us with positive criticism ! But our ranks are not closed. Our doors and windows stay open, and we are ready to welcome all those who, in a spirit of goodwill and brotherly trust and in the bond of faith, wish to come to an understanding with us. We are absolutely convinced that our brethren and co-workers, from whatever circles they come, will have every opportunity to express their opinions and to contribute to a deeper, theologically acceptable consensus everything which they consider essential. Moreover, in the discussion they will recognize how their point of view or their understanding of today's major international problems has a Western tinge and must be re-examined. It does not occur to us to dismiss their views as sheer propaganda. On the contrary, we try, and shall continue to try, to discuss all problems on the basis of their real weight and to continue to struggle together to find our common ground. It is simply a question of our submitting ourselves to the merciful and guiding Word of the crucified and risen Lord, and of overcoming our differences and disagreements in the very heart of the gospel. We want to fight with all our strength the atmosphere and mood of suspicion, mistrust, self-righteousness, and self-assurance which poison the air around us and break the bond of faith, because we long

for a *rapprochement* between those groups which are divorced from one another, in spite of all the curtains, fences, and walls which separate us from each other today.

Preparation for the All-Christian Peace Assembly

The third session of the Christian Peace Conference was in a sense a preparation for the All-Christian Peace Assembly to be held in June 1961. A perusal of the documents and material from this session will clearly reveal this concern and this significance. We do not presume to monopolize Christian work for peace and to be or to become *the* voice of peace. We have no illusions about reaching and representing all areas and sections of the Church. Our powers are not sufficient for that. Our Assembly will be on an entirely different level from that of the Assembly of the World Council of Churches, to be held in New Delhi, for example. We do not want to run the risk, or fall into the temptation, of appearing to be in competition with the ecumenical bodies and conferences. On the contrary, it is our concern to assist and stimulate the ecumenical Christian family united in the World Council of Churches. Through our work and the Assembly in June 1961, we should like, however, to express our deep anxiety about the ever-increasing tension and danger at the present moment. Today's situation unnerves us more than that of three years ago. We find ourselves being pushed towards the brink of a catastrophe or abyss. We want to make our voice heard: the voice of warning, but also the voice of a burning desire and sense of responsibility to do everything possible to reduce the danger in the name of Jesus Christ, to contribute something significant, even with our limited and weak forces, to the solution of the problems, to the reconciliation of peoples, and to seek a way out of the evil impasse. The official ecumenical Assembly will occupy itself with a host of different questions and themes. We, however, want to concentrate on a single theme: reconciliation, peace, disarmament, co-operation, trust, and brotherhood. And further, we want to mobilize and put to work the churches, groups, and personalities who stand outside the firmly moulded ecumenical structure, and whose voices may prove to be important, valuable, and meaningful.

The word "all-Christian" should not be taken literally, nor understood in a numerical, even less in a geographical, sense. In our work we want to express what we firmly believe lies deep in every Christian heart, regardless of national, power-political, historical, and confessional barriers, and which today must be declared without delay, without fear. We are also counting on the fact that the Assembly planned for June 1961 will not be the last, and that its voice will be heard throughout the Christian world. Yes, the situation is grave and our responsibility terrifyingly great — not only for the Christian world but for all mankind. We must not be silent ; we must not be intimidated by voices of suspicion or even of defamation. "And some of the Pharisees in the multitude said to him, 'Teacher, rebuke your disciples.' He answered, 'I tell you, if these were silent, the very stones would cry out.' " (Luke 19 : 39-40.)

The crucified and risen Lord have mercy upon us !

The Church in the Midst of Power Struggle in the Atomic Age

ALAN R. BOOTH

When one sits down to answer an examination paper, the temptation often arises to complain that the questions asked are not the most important ones and certainly are not ones that lend themselves most readily to an answer. Similarly, it is tempting for the Church at this moment in history not to grapple with the realities of the perplexing questions which God is addressing to mankind this year through the political developments and technical discoveries of our time, but to seek an escape from them by denouncing the fact that such questions should ever have arisen. The very words "power struggle" suggest a phenomenon that a decent Christian must deplore. A word or two may, therefore, be in place about it.

A Christian view of power

The word "power" has become a word of ill repute, particularly in such contexts as power politics, the balance of power, etc. There are good and bad reasons for this. The power accessible to men is now on such a scale that its use could be extremely sinister. The size and complexity of human organizations nowadays can concentrate power dangerously. On the other hand, in this democratic age, governments are tempted to disguise their use of power over the community by propaganda designed to suggest that that power is mainly used over anti-social elements, and that otherwise the government does what the people want. This heightens the secular utopian illusion that all nice people can get along together perfectly well without being constrained from above, if only the black sheep can be removed from the flock.

Our Christian thinking in this matter has been somewhat beset by a confusion of understanding between the activities

of God in creation and in redemption. The heart of the gospel is God's seeking of man's willing faith in the humility of suffering. But the arena of the gospel is a world created by the fiat of the Creator in terms which brook no argument. Father Kelly used to tell the British Student Christian Movement at its summer conference that the first experience of the child of a reality beyond its parents was an experience of God as sheer power. The child put its finger in the fire and was burned. The law of gravity operated without awaiting our consent. God uses power not to convert men but to make possible the conditions of their life on earth. It is perhaps the peculiar temptation of the preacher and the intellectual to overlook the fact that all human achievements in terms of the Creation involve the use of power. Not least is this the case with the creation of human societies out of the diversity of individual wills and purposes.

The theological justification for the exercise of power by government has often been given in the form that man's sinfulness requires the exercise of authority to restrain it. In a revolutionary age, the natural answer has been that governments are there to exercise power not only as policemen but to end eternal arguments and to reach communal decisions. The city of Oxford suffers traffic chaos not only because university people have a sophisticated capacity for rationalizing their vested interest in property, but also because genuine differences of opinion exist about the design of relief roads, and the authorities have felt fearful of concluding the matter. Thus chaos continues, and it may be difficult to get to a meeting of the SCM where men might be converted, not just because of human criminality, but because of a failure to exercise power in favour of any one of the possible solutions to the traffic problem.

The task of the CCIA

It has been the function of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, as agent of the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council, to take seriously those whose function it is to exercise power in inter-

national political life and to make such personal contacts as opportunity offered. The purpose of the operation has been to make available to such people whatever Christian wisdom might emanate from the churches of the world to guide them in their task. It has to be confessed that the sum total of this wisdom is not yet great, but this is scarcely surprising in view of the fact that responsible ecumenical involvement in this field is a recent institution. We learn the doctrine by trying to do the will of God and then reflecting upon our action in the light of the gospel.

Before, however, pursuing the theology of the task further, one word more on its practicality. Evidently the access which members and officers of the Commission may have to those who exercise some degree of power in the international scene varies greatly. Those countries in which the member churches of the ecumenical movement play a major part in the national life offer the easiest opportunities, and among such countries some have much larger influence on the international scene than others. The corridors of the United Nations building in New York offer a very wide field of personal contact. The style and conventions of Western democratic societies, whatever their ultimate validity, obviously offer better chances of personal contact and conversation which can be thought to influence policy than do the people's democracies of the East. These are facts which the Commission has to recognize without becoming a slave to them. It would be wrong not to do something anywhere because you cannot do it everywhere. It would be equally wrong to accept the position passively. Nor need it be so accepted. When, for instance, the officers of the Commission wished to represent to the official delegates at the Geneva Conference on the Cessation of Atomic Tests the views of the ecumenical movement, it was possible not only to sit down with Mr. Wadsworth of the United States and later Mr. Ormsby-Gore of the United Kingdom for half an hour's conversation, but equally to be courteously received by Mr. Tsarapkin of Russia and to have a frank conversation with him in the name of the churches.

Considerations governing the work of CCIA

This last illustration demands some further words on the position of the churches in the power struggle of our day. We recognize that the chief protagonists are the two major powers. Although their struggle may dominate our minds at the moment, we must remember that this particular constellation of power will not be eternal. At present, however, we must live in a situation where each of these major political powers is seeking to influence the development of a unified world in such a way that it can feel at home in it. The ensuing struggle is as inevitable as would be the case in any human organization which had two equal managers, each with different ideas. The theoretical answer for such a world as this is obviously the creation of some kind of responsible world government. This in turn would challenge the churches with the problem of how such a world government could be devised so that it did not at the same time threaten to impose intolerable restrictions on human development, freedom, and non-conformity. This, however, is not the immediate problem, because men's minds today are very far from being ready for such development. The only tolerable *modus vivendi* (in the strictest sense) in this situation of international anarchy is to maintain continuous pressure for disputes to be settled by compromise and negotiation, and for full use to be made of such vestigial international machinery as exists for reconciling opposing wills.

These considerations provided some of the grounds for intervention by the officers of CCIA, for instance, in favour of arranging an armistice in Korea, and with the churches in Britain and France at the time of the Suez crisis. But so long as the existing international institutions are devoid of effective political power, and so long as the locus of ultimate political decision lies in the capitals of the great powers, some air of unreality must always surround the intervention of organs of the United Nations in major disputes. This problem cannot be solved, but simply must be lived with under present circumstances. Moreover, it is an illusion to think that negotiations are an alternative to the exercise of power. Anyone with experience of international negotiations knows full well that the course

of these negotiations is determined by what each side thinks it can command and what it believes it can only request. Nor are statesmen free, as the recent breakdown of the summit talks has vividly demonstrated, to meet each other as individuals, and to reach agreements by the exercise of personal forbearance and charity. They are representatives of by no means passive societies and subject to large and relatively anonymous pressures, and their problem is to find ways of adjusting conflicting pressures in a civilized manner, without subjecting humanity to the disaster of a test of strength up to the limit.

These are the considerations that have greatly influenced the work of the Commission in questions of disarmament, atomic weapons, and the cessation of atomic tests. To give advice or advocate policies in these fields which do not recognize what has been said above is to risk total irrelevancy, and therefore to fail to influence events in any way. In all the statements and representations which the Commission has made to governments or statesmen individually (and which are on record for those who wish to study them), it will be seen that the Commission has tried to understand the reality of the problem which a statesman faces, and to suggest courses of action which seem to have the best hope of life for humanity. Such a method of working disappoints those who look for "an outspoken and courageous word", but the Commission has had always to keep before its mind the question, not whether it would give pleasure to its friends, but how it could faithfully serve humanity in the name of Jesus Christ.

All this may give the impression that the issues at stake between the great powers are simply issues of who should control whom. This impression has been deliberately created because it is the temptation of the protagonists themselves to hide this element of sheer rivalry and to pretend that the point at issue is of ultimate and general significance. In this sense mankind is always tempted to give religious value to its creation, which is idolatry. It is surely one of the functions of the churches in the power struggle to call clearly in question the self-righteousness of nations who tend to identify their own cause with the cause of God, or the cause of humanity at large.

But this has to be done in such a way as not to suggest that the issue between the nations is of no real consequence at all. It is simply to insist that man's salvation is not a political salvation, nor is it in the hands of any government to give back to mankind its lost humanity. It is the function of political powers to create conditions which give men a chance to be human, and it cannot be said that the final solution of this problem has been discovered anywhere as yet in the modern world. Nevertheless, certain political conditions either create greater possibilities or preserve more open opportunities of development for the future, and in such matters the churches must try to make up their minds where the balance of advantage lies, without becoming involved in the pseudo-religious pretensions of so much ideological debate. These are the considerations which have led the Commission from time to time to advocate respect for the rule of law, the open society, respect for human rights without distinction of race or class, and the observance of religious liberty by all governments. This involves activities ranging from a major part in the formulation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, through consultations with governments and officials in the framing of new constitutions for emerging nations and representations in the appropriate quarter concerning restrictions on religious liberty, to activities designed to assist, at the proper time, the transference of power from metropolitan powers to the inhabitants of dependent countries.

Problems created by modern military technology

It is essential, in conclusion, to add a word, however inadequate, on the specific problems created by modern military technology, of which atomic weapons are only one example. Churches everywhere are deeply involved, along with the rest of humanity, in the controversies and agonies of mind which these developments create. We want to put an end to military violence, with all that this can now entail. We want to see nuclear energy rigidly restricted to peaceful uses. But what are the steps which lead from the place where we are at present to that Promised Land? Declarations of condemnation, state-

ments of disassociation by Christian groups from any participation in nuclear warfare no doubt have a general effect on the climate of opinion, but unhappily we all know that it will take deeper thought and more skilful action to avert the disaster we apprehend. Members of the Commission have taken initiatives to bring together politicians, defence experts, journalists specializing in such questions, clergy, and others to help to initiate objective and responsible study, and to devise wise policies. The experience has disclosed that far more serious homework is being done on these matters outside official Christian groups than inside them. The strength of Christian condemnation is so far not matched by an equal discipline in studying the realities of the situation and the best means to employ to save mankind from annihilation. The Commission has concluded that there is one objective within reach which, while good in itself, would have even more important indirect effects — an agreement to cease atomic tests. It would hinder the multiplication of atomic powers, it would institute a measure of arms control which could then be elaborated further in other directions, and it would contribute to an easing of international tension and suspicion. The officers of the Commission have gone further in elaborating other measures of arms control which, in their view, would put no nation in such a position of advantage that it would be tempted to make a dash for supremacy, and would threaten no nation with such a disadvantage that it would be tempted to sudden action to restore its relative strength. It has examined measures designed to reduce the danger of surprise attack, a danger which brings in its train the possibility of war by mistake. It has further drawn attention to the fact that international agreements concerning the use of outer space might, if reached quickly, forestall the development of a further area of acute danger.

"To achieve will mean more..."

Does all this seem like trifling, earnestly and busily, when what is needed is a clear Christian word which cuts the Gordian knot and institutes a new day? No doubt, if a clear word would have these results, it should be spoken, but just because the

situation is so grave, the onus lies upon us as Christians to calculate whether the speaking of such a word is of itself enough. We are called to be prophets, but also to wash the feet of humanity, and if the former requires vision, the latter necessitates the procuring of soap, water, and a towel. The problem before humanity is both a moral and spiritual one, and also a technical one of enabling the human spirit to master and control the forces which it has disclosed. To think otherwise is to underestimate the plight of humanity and the rigour of the duties which lie upon us as Christians. To speak is easy; to achieve will, in the end, mean more for mankind.

The World Student Christian Federation and Peace Today

GERHARD BASSARAK

We believe in a Kingdom of peace where there will be neither hatred, nor fear, nor death anymore: then we cannot lightly accept class conflict, military or economic warfare. We must fight for peace. In this way also we proclaim the Kingdom of God.

PHILIPPE MAURY: *Politics and Evangelism*, p. 64.

Peace has more than one meaning

It is rather difficult for me to write on the subject, "The World Student Christian Federation and Peace Today". Although I was a pastor in the service of the *Evangelische Studentengemeinde* in the German Democratic Republic for almost five years and had many good contacts with the Federation, I have at no time been in a position to survey its possibilities. Having now held a different post for the last three years, I must be even more careful in giving an opinion on the Federation's activities. I can neither describe nor criticize what it does or does not do. To avoid carrying coals to Newcastle, I should like to add a few basic remarks to the passage I have quoted at the beginning of this article from Philippe Maury's book.

Politics and evangelism

There the word "peace" occurs twice. In each case it has a different meaning though, strangely enough, this becomes clear only in the contrast. What I mean is this: unlike hatred, fear, and death, peace is not a worldly condition. The peace which this world can give will have to be created *despite* hatred, fear, and death. Indeed, in this connection Philippe Maury is dealing with God's Kingdom of peace as believed in by Christians. Christian faith is no illusion and therefore demands consequences. In terms of earthly peace, these may be described

as being opposed to class conflict, military and economic warfare. The responsibility of Christians to *this* peace is expressed in a sentence which any Marxist would accept: "We must fight for peace." How should Christians fight for peace without using the means of revolution (class conflict), weapons (military warfare), or embargo (economic warfare)?

It could be that one of the first great problems in the commitment to peace arises from the failure to agree on *what* peace is. According to Greek etymology, *eirene* means a state of uneasiness, an interruption of war — "the father of all things". Peace is the lack, the loss, the absence of war. For the Latin lawyer, *pax* (from *pactum*) was a legal relationship between the parties to a contract, set forth in a document containing their signatures and thereby made static. The German language is not as precise as Greek and Latin. The German word peace (*Friede*) means mercy on the vanquished. As a token of this the victor offers the defeated his hand. Siegfried, the name of a German national hero, clearly demonstrates the character of this peace (*Sieg* = victory, *Friede* = peace). Later, peace (as in *Burgfried* = the defence tower of a castle) also came to mean shelter, protection, friendship, love. *Mir*, the Russian word for peace, stands for the village community but also for the world as a whole. In a heated discussion between a group of Protestant pastors from West Berlin invited by the Russian Orthodox Church to visit the Soviet Union, and atheist members of the Soviet Peace Council, the atheists said with great feeling: "For us peace is a sacred word." Perhaps one of the first and most worthwhile tasks of the Federation would be to suggest to its members, the national Student Christian Movements, that they make a compilation of the different interpretations of the word "peace" current in their areas. This might yield an impressive symposium.

At a conference in Berlin, Kentaro Shiozuki said that Europeans see peace only from the aspect of how war can be avoided. Peace, however, is not a negative thing (cf. the Greek concept). In Asia the question is rather, how is it possible to prepare, preserve, foster, and promote peace? If one thinks of how much sacrifice, suffering, and surrendering of freedom is endured for the sake of war, should one not consider whether

the cause of peace is not worth a similar stake? Such a consideration necessarily transcends the national interpretations of peace as they are expressed by the different languages, and demands inquiry into the great concepts of peace throughout the history of mankind. Here there might be a second worthwhile intellectual task for the Federation to undertake. For example, Immanuel Kant — and here we must understand him as a child of the Enlightenment — has a utopian vision of eternal peace. It is created by means of pacts in which the big, powerful states in particular accept certain restrictions among themselves and towards smaller states. An age which could afford Utopias was considered a happy one; that part of today's fiction which claims the name of utopian gives much more metopian pictures, ones which no one would want to come true. Kant's heritage has been liquidated in German idealism. The idealist is so convinced of his own virtues and right-mindedness that he lays the blame for violated peace on others, as illustrated in these lines from Schiller's *William Tell*:

*Es kann der Frömmste nicht in Frieden leben,
Wenn es dem bösen Nachbar nicht gefällt.*

Today the communist concept of peace is of great significance. It is based on the idea of world revolution which leads to social justice in a classless society. As against this there are Western concepts, of which, however, there are no representative exponents and no ready-made programs. These concepts are somewhat vague, but as far as one can see they would maintain freedom as a *conditio sine qua non* of peace¹.

Peace in the Bible

Related to these concepts of peace are the biblical pronouncements on peace. These are not uniform, since the various books of the Bible were written over a period of one thousand years. However, the main streams of thought are clear. With a harsh and sober realism, the prophecies of the Old Testament oppose

¹ Mention should be made of the founding of the so-called historic Peace Churches and the power inherent in the concepts of peace in the great non-Christian religions.

glossing over the absence of peace. This is most clearly expressed by Jeremiah when he says, "Peace, peace, and there is no peace." Peace (*shalom*) is not a state limited to certain spheres of life like the Greek *eirene*. *Shalom* embraces them all. Thus King David asks Uriah about the *shalom* of the war (II Samuel 11 : 7 : "...how the war prospered"). *Shalom* is not a static relationship like the latin *pax*, but vital, dynamic, and reciprocal. When *shalom* reigns, former enemies give their sons and daughters in marriage. *Shalom* is not dictated and accepted, a peace whose protective power ultimately remains limited to the personal sphere, as it had originally been in Germany. *Shalom* is collective, general, public, belonging to society. *Shalom* makes the earth habitable, life worth living, people lovable, and material goods desirable. Nowhere in the Old Testament does *shalom* denote "a specifically spiritual attitude which comes from an inner peace"¹. In the Old Testament and also for Jesus and his disciples *shalom* means happening, event, occurrence, process, conduct. The prophetic eschatological emphasis that it is God who accomplishes this process, who brings his Kingdom to fulfilment, in no way releases the sons of God from their responsibility for *shalom*.

In the seventh beatitude of the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus blesses those whom God will call to be his sons, that is, those who are peacemakers on earth. This blessing applies to the first Christians, poor and of low social status, and in their weakness he grants them a power which the Roman emperors have by virtue of their office. Antony called the murdered Caesar "peacemaker". This then became the permanent title of the Roman emperors. They likewise styled themselves the sons of God. Jesus and his people appropriated what was attributed to the powerful of the earth, thus making a great and mighty claim. Modern Christian pride has given birth to the view that the taking over by the Christians of this manner of speaking annulled the legitimacy of imperial political power and dignity and established Christians as the true peacemakers of the world. The Sermon on the Mount not only allows the powerful peacemakers on earth their glory but also declares the

¹ VON RAD, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* II, 425.

Gentile authorities to be sons of God. This stands in direct line with Romans 13. The powerful are not aware of Jesus' judgment on them but his people know it. The pagan "emperors of peace" who regard themselves as autonomous, absolute, sons of gods, gods even, are regarded by the Christian community as neither autonomous nor absolute, nor sons of gods, nor gods, but as sons of the one God and Father of Jesus Christ, like Christians, because Jesus Christ became man and brother to all men. The eyes of faith draw together the powerful of the earth with all their mighty deeds, and the weak and powerless followers of Christ. All are sons of God who actively and passively makes peace, the salvation of the world. With this statement the Sermon on the Mount forms a continuity with the political peace concepts of the Old Testament prophets. One would be inclined to say that it transcends them.

Christ transcends the eschatological promise of peace of the Old Testament prophets by fulfilling it. His coming is the dawn of the Kingdom of peace. The letter to the Ephesians puts it even more concretely: Christ is our peace. The effect of this affirmation can be explained by the converse: Christ has taken away the enmity which God's good law aroused between God's people and other peoples. This law, the sign of enmity, is described as a wall of partition. If we enlarge upon the image in Ephesians, chapter 2, the cross itself is made from the wood of the partition. The cross of Christ, the Man Jesus who dies on the cross, who rises again, and is ever present, now stands between those who believe in him and those who do not. Between believers and unbelievers Christ's cross has a function contrary to that of the law. The law differentiated between and divided Jews and Gentiles, the religious and the godless, believers and unbelievers; the cross of Christ binds Jews and Gentiles, the religious and the godless, believers and unbelievers, Christians and atheists. The peace which Christ brings, which he is, is not an automatically effective, miraculous power. This peace demands our faith and his power. Christ does not guarantee his people a peaceful life free from the hostility of those who do not know him. Christ calls upon his people to keep peace, make peace, create peace. The disciples will enter the houses of those who know nothing of God's peace with the greeting

of peace on their lips. They will offer them, and bring them, this peace. This does not mean that they will be welcomed with open arms. They will be distrusted. They will be rejected. They will be persecuted. They have no other weapons but the weapon of peace: as sheep they will face the wolves. Christ, who through the Holy Communion gives himself to his own, calls upon Christendom to become the (Holy) Communion of the world. Thus can Christ, who is the peace, say that he has not come to bring peace but the sword. The sword is the symbol of dissension (and not of war; cf. Matthew 10: 34 with Luke 12: 51). The Christian community offering itself to the world for the sake of peace meets with opposition, refusal, rejection, hatred. But that is not all: within the community there is dissension between those who, obedient to Christ's command, want to go into the world to bring peace and to serve as the salt of the earth, and those others who do not wish to have the old wall of partition torn down, who hold the front of the religious against the godless. The Church's self-assertion before the world might be the present-day form of the self-justification of the religious. Such self-assertion is dangerous for the Church, for in making it the Church ceases to be the Church. It is dangerous for the world because then Christian acts of peace are absent from the world.

The fight for peace

In this Christian perspective, what can a fight for peace imply? It is obvious that this cannot be a fight for Christ, a fight for the spreading of the gospel. Any form of a crusade, by means of either hot or cold war, hinders rather than helps evangelism. Here we should recall Christ's words to Peter: "Put up your sword into its sheath." We do not have to fight for Christ; it is Christ who fights for us and dies for us. The Christian fight for peace is, or so it seems to me, a fight which Christians have to take up against themselves.

No class struggle. This does not mean telling the oppressed and exploited class, in the name of the gospel, "You must not start a revolution". It can only mean opening the eyes of the possessors who maintain the class struggle, perhaps involun-

tarily, and who do not see the starving victims, since they starve in the shadows, and if this does not succeed, in exposing them, accusing them, before the eyes of the world, of having relentlessly and with apparently just means continued the class struggle. It means opening the eyes of many who call themselves Christians to their positions within this class struggle and the part they play in it, as a warning to them to make peace.

No economic warfare. For those Christians living in countries which follow an embargo policy, this would mean not participating in actions which promote economic warfare. This would probably involve considerable financial loss. Are Christians prepared to fight thus against themselves for the sake of peace ?

No military warfare. For Christians this would mean not putting earthly values, either national values, or economic achievements, or private considerations, above the lives of those whom they are supposed to kill because they belong to a hostile nation. It would mean a demand for consistent pacifism, which would involve renouncing the right of self-defence. The peace of Christians cannot be a peace which they demand from others but which they offer to all others. The consequences might possibly be very far reaching. They could make peace, the inherent readiness for peace, the criterion for all other virtues. They could exclude every other alternative. Certainly no attempt has ever been made to find out what this would be like. "Peace at any price" might be the only alternative to the atomic suicide of mankind. The expression, "Better dead than a slave", may have held good in times when great individual decisions counted for something, but today it is definitely irreligious, and for Christians it ought always to have been so. For Christ himself comes as a slave ; Paul calls himself a slave, and sends Onesimus, a slave, back to his master. The Christians' extremely practical offer of peace will perhaps bear the fruits which the world has been fighting for passionately, with great sacrifices, but so far in vain : justice, freedom, unity, fraternity.

In a letter written shortly before his death, Hans Joachim Iwand said of the last Synod of the Evangelical church in Germany : "This Synod was disgraceful. It was thinking only of itself.

It was afraid of being shattered by the gospel. And see how 'fraternity' again triumphed over God's command. In thus — supposedly — 'sticking together' in the gospel, they really raised themselves above it. 'Togetherness' won the day and the Word perished. God can be effective only by destroying this 'togetherness'." This raises a question for the Federation and the ecumenical movement as a whole : do we put Christian unity above peace ? If we do, we risk losing both unity and peace. If we search together for peace, fight for peace, we might achieve unity also.

Gotthilf Weber writes ¹ : "While during the Reformation it was the relation between faith and works, in the 18th century the slavery question, in the 19th century social problems, today it is undoubtedly the question of peace for which we have a Christian directive which we cannot ignore."

¹ In a publication celebrating Gertrud Kurz's seventieth birthday, Zollikon Verlag, 1960.

A Survey of Recent Pacifist Literature

DALE AUKERMAN

I

The theological background

THE CHRISTIAN AND WAR: A THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION OF JUSTICE, PEACE AND LOVE. The Historic Peace Churches and the Fellowship of Reconciliation, 1958. 47 pp. \$0.25.

KARL BARTH AND CHRISTIAN PACIFISM, by John H. Yoder. Agape Verlag, Basle, 1957. 47 pp. \$0.25.

REINHOLD NIEBUHR AND CHRISTIAN PACIFISM, by John H. Yoder. Heerewegen Pamphlet Number One, Zeist, Netherlands, 1954. 23 pp. \$0.25.

THE WRATH OF GOD AND THE LOVE OF GOD, by John H. Yoder. Agape Verlag, Basle, 1956. 11 pp. \$0.10.

BERICHT ÜBER ISERLOHN. Agape Verlag, Basle, 1960. 112 pp., paper cover. DM 3.00.

DIE EVANGELISCHE PREDIGT VOM FRIEDEN, by H.-W. Bartsch. Herbert Reich Verlag, Hamburg, 1958. 78 pp. DM 2.40.

All but the last of these can be conveniently obtained from the Mennonite Central Committee, Akron, Pennsylvania, and Frankfurt/Main, Eysseneckstrasse 54.

The Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam in 1948 received unanimously and commended to the churches a report containing the words: "We are one in proclaiming to all mankind: war is contrary to the Will of God." The report acknowledged a deep sense of perplexity in the face of the conflicting opinions expressed on the question whether war can now be an act of justice, and it urged on all Christians the duty of wrestling continuously with the difficulties

that these conflicting opinions raise, and of praying humbly for God's guidance. It added: "We believe there is a special call to theologians to consider the theological problems involved" (89, 90-A).

In 1953 the so-called Historic Peace Churches, the Church of the Brethren, the Society of Friends, and the Mennonites, plus the Fellowship of Reconciliation, presented to the World Council a response to this "special call" titled "Peace is the Will of God". Later Angus Dun and Reinhold Niebuhr countered this with "God Wills Both Justice and Peace". The Historic Peace Churches replied in "God Establishes Both Peace and Justice". These three statements have now been published together in a booklet, *The Christian and War*, and constitute the most incisive and enlightening dialogue between pacifists and non-pacifists that has yet appeared.

"Peace is the Will of God" gives a critique of such "extraneous presuppositions" as the "just war", war as the lesser evil, and the antinomian concept of grace inherent in the non-pacifist defence of deliberate sinning. The study urges that unless the Church, trusting the power of God in whose hand lie the destinies of the nations, is willing to renounce war absolutely, it can have no prophetic word for the present world of nations. A Church committed to a creative Christian pacifism could bring into world affairs a transformation as yet unimagined.

Dun and Niebuhr reiterate the charges that pacifism distorts the command of love and applies an individual ethic to a collective situation. In their view even a total nuclear war may still be a just war.

"God Establishes Both Peace and Justice" maintains that the concept of justice basic to the Dun-Niebuhr approach is non-biblical. In Old Testament thought, God's righteous judgment (*tsedeq*) is intimately linked with his saving activity, and the *tsedeq* of God is normative for all human justice. For the early Christians Jesus was the "righteousness of God", and the idea that their just obligations to their fellow-men should be defined by any justice other than the righteousness of God revealed in Christ's self-abasement and love was unthinkable. The social ethic of the early Christians was nothing other than

the collective expression of the redeeming and sacrificial agape of their Master.

Some of the acutest recent theological writing relative to pacifism has been done by the young Mennonite theologian, John H. Yoder. His *Karl Barth and Christian Pacifism* restricts itself to "internal criticisms" to show that what Barth says on war is not consistent with his theology as a whole. Barth's position is quite near Christian pacifism, nearer, writes Yoder, than that of any other really prominent theologian in the history of European Protestant dogmatics. Barth says that the "just war" tradition is an increasingly intolerable deformation of Christian truth, and even that the pacifist position is "almost infinitely right". Yet Barth, in his determinative concern to recognize God's sovereignty, believes that in rare extreme situations God may command the Christian to wage war. Yoder's critique focuses on Barth's defence of the *Grenzfall*, the exceptional case, and on the issue of how one can in a situation know whether it is really God who commands going to war.

Step by step Yoder shows the ungroundedness of Barth's *Grenzfall* as an ethical tool. Against Barth's form of the "lesser evil" argument, the basis really of his reasoning, Yoder levels extensive criticism. In this line of thinking, what must be chosen is not the *lesser* evil but the *least* evil. Barth, and the usual non-pacifists far more than he, can naively assume that waging war or losing all are the only alternatives; but there are further alternatives given by God in his creative sovereignty which must be honestly examined. Contrary to Barth's call for heroic Swiss defence against a Hitler at no matter what the cost, the "lesser evil" argument demands a preponderant probability that military defence or readiness for military defence will be effective, for to lose a war *and* what the war was fought to defend is clearly a "greater evil" than the loss involved in not fighting a war. The argument that war is the lesser evil, if it is to be valid, must come near guaranteeing that the post-war situation which will thereby be created will be better than the post-crisis situation which would have come into being had there been no war.

In another study, *Reinhold Niebuhr and Christian Pacifism*, Yoder grounds his objection on the fact that Niebuhr derives

his ethics, not from God's redemption, as does the Bible, but from man's predicament, thus becoming an ethical pluralist and slighting the resurrection, the Church, and the work of the Holy Spirit. In *The Wrath of God and the Love of God*, Yoder begins from the question of hell, which is taken to mean essentially that you *can* be let alone if you want to be. God will not impose himself on man. God's love respects the beloved so far that, if that man who is the object of God's love wishes to destroy himself, he can. Thus God's love and his wrath are the same thing. Jesus' temptation, in Yoder's view, centred on the possibility of taking over the world and imposing God's will. But Jesus let the perfectly just cause be utterly refused by man; he took on himself the extremity of man's rebellion. In the cross is the ultimate in agape, confronting killing, which is sin *par excellence*, the most direct opposite of agape, because it takes away most completely the freedom of its object.

The Iserlohn (Germany) Theological Peace Conference of 1957 was a conversation between European and American pacifists and non-pacifists. Its weighty lectures have now been published as *Bericht über Iserlohn*. Contributors range from Ernst Worl on the Reformers' teachings about discipleship to H.-W. Bartsch on "Peace in the Preaching of the Church". Bartsch's full development of this theme appears in his book, *Die evangelische Predigt vom Frieden*. To the anticipated charge that his emphasis on preaching from the command, "Thou shalt not kill", is legalistic, Bartsch replies that the real legalism is characteristic of the rich young man who thinks his hands are clean, or of those who swear by the temple, but not by the gold in the temple, when Christ wants radical discipleship, not these subtle differentiations. The real legalists are not those who take God's command on killing seriously, but those who, in the tradition of Constantine, Athanasius, and Augustine, start to introduce limitations on non-killing, sometimes supposedly to tone the command down to the level of the "possible".

The standard book-length theological presentations of Christian pacifism are not quite "recent". Jean Lasserre was a non-pacifist as he began his book, *La Guerre et*

*l'Evangile*¹, but through the study and thinking involved came to write the most cogent exegetical defence of pacifism yet produced. G. H. C. Macgregor's *The New Testament Basis of Pacifism*² is the classic English work; Culbert Rutenber's *The Dagger and the Cross*³ is the most forceful American book.

Reconciliation Quarterly (formerly *Christus Victor*)⁴ is the journal of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation. Typical of its probing scholarly tone are such recent articles as "Luther and the Turks", by Clarence Bauman, "Education and the Power of Love", by Hans Thirring, and "Luther's Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms", by Anders Nygren, with replies by various pacifists.

*Fellowship*⁵, largest in circulation and oldest among pacifist journals, ranges in content from theology to social analysis and factual studies on current issues. So does *Cahiers de la Réconciliation*⁶. More imposingly theological is *Junge Kirche*⁷, monthly forum for German *Bruderschaften* thinkers.

¹ *La Guerre et l'Evangile*, by JEAN LASSERRE. La Réconciliation, Paris, 1933. 248 pp., paper cover. 5 NF. German: *Der Krieg und das Evangelium*. Chr. Kaiser Verlag, München, 1956. 319 pp. DM 14.80. English: *War and the Gospel*. To be published by James Clarke & Co., London, and the Mennonite Publishing House, Scottsdale, Pennsylvania, in 1961.

² *The New Testament Basis of Pacifism*, by G. H. C. MACGREGOR. Fellowship of Reconciliation, London, reprint, 1958. 106 pp. 5s. Fellowship, Nyack, New York, reprint, 1960 (including *The Relevance of an Impossible Ideal*). 160 pp., paper cover. \$1.25. In German as, *Friede auf Erden?* Chr. Kaiser Verlag, München, 1955. 159 pp., paper cover. DM 4.80.

³ *The Dagger and the Cross*, by CULBERT G. RUTENBER. Fellowship, Nyack, New York, reprint, 1958. 142 pp., paper cover. \$1.50.

⁴ *Reconciliation Quarterly*. International Fellowship of Reconciliation, 3, Hendon Avenue, Finchley, London, N.3. 5s. a year.

⁵ *Fellowship*. The Fellowship of Reconciliation, Box 271, Nyack, New York. \$3.00 a year.

⁶ *Cahiers de la Réconciliation*. Mouvement international de la Réconciliation, 1, rue Louis-Soulié, Saint-Etienne (Loire), France. 6 NF a year.

⁷ *Junge Kirche*. Dortmund, Schliepstrasse 11. DM 4.80 a quarter.

II

The historical background

EVANGILE ET LABARUM, by Jean-Michel Hornus. Nouvelle série théologique N° 9. Labor et Fides, Geneva, 1960. 195 pp., paper cover. 18.80 NF.

CHRISTIAN ATTITUDES TOWARD WAR AND PEACE, by Roland H. Bainton. Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tennessee, 1960. 304 pp. \$4.75.

CHRISTIAN PACIFISM IN HISTORY, by Geoffrey F. Nuttall. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1958. 84 pp. 10s. 6d.

DER STAAT IM NEUEN TESTAMENT, by Oscar Cullmann. Mohr Verlag, Tübingen, 1956. 84 pp. DM 8.—. English edition: THE STATE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, SCM Press, London, 1957. 123 pp. 12s. 6d. French edition: DIEU ET CÉSAR, Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchâtel, 1956. 120 pp.

Jean-Michel Hornus's *Evangile et Labarum* is a masterful study of the Church's attitude towards war during the first centuries after Christ. Through closely analyzing a host of passages from the Fathers, plus other relevant records, Hornus counters the various types of attempts to minimize the anti-militarism of the early Church, which is shown to have had a united witness against participation in war. Thus, though Christians did come to be soldiers in the Roman army, we learn of this development first from Tertullian, who laments it. Christian apologetic could illustrate the universality of the gospel by pointing even to such soldiers, but this did not at all mean approval of their profession.

Roland H. Bainton, author of the Luther biography, *Here I Stand*, presents in his new book, *Christian Attitudes toward War and Peace*, a thoroughly documented study of pacifism, the just war, and the crusade as manifested in church history from the earliest times to the present. Like all Professor Bainton's writing, this book combines high scholarship with a lucid style and perceptive insight. It becomes at publication an

indispensable treatment of the controversial problem. (Probably the most adequate article-length presentation of pacifism is Bainton's "Christian Pacifism Reassessed", originally appearing in *The Christian Century* and now available in reprint form.¹

Geoffrey F. Nuttall's *Christian Pacifism in History* provides a shorter generalizing survey by taking soundings, as he puts it, at five different periods of Christian history. The main pacifism of each period is found to have its own distinguishing emphasis. Nuttall sees contemporary pacifism as taking up these earlier emphases and being more fully related to all the great themes of Christianity, especially redemption.

Der Staat im Neuen Testament by Oscar Cullmann (not a pacifist) provides relevant and vivid insight into the extent to which Jesus moved in a Zealot context and was continually taking a political stance. Jesus, under constant pressure to try the military solution, chose the opposite way.

III

Nuclear pacifism

UM DIE ZUKUNFT DES MENSCHEN IM ATOMAREN ZEITALTER, by Heinrich Vogel. Lettner-Verlag, Berlin, 1960. 220 pp., paper cover. DM 4.80.

DIE CHRISTEN UND DIE ATOMWAFFEN, by Helmut Gollwitzer. Theologische Existenz Heute, Heft 61. Chr. Kaiser Verlag, München, 1957. 51 pp. DM 2.—. French edition, Labor et Fides, Geneva, 1958. Dutch translation, in *Wending*, January 1958.

CHRISTIANS AND THE PREVENTION OF WAR IN AN ATOMIC AGE — A THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION. World Council of Churches, Division of Studies, Geneva, 1958. 43 pp.

¹ Single copies free from the Brethren Service Commission, Elgin, Illinois, or the Puidoux Secretariat, Kassel-R., Witzenhäuserstrasse 5, Germany.

PROPOSALS FOR THE REVISION OF THE PROVISIONAL STUDY DOCUMENT OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES: "CHRISTIANS AND THE PREVENTION OF WAR IN AN ATOMIC AGE". Boston. 9 pp. Available from President Herbert Gezork, Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Center, Massachusetts.

An increasing number of nuclear realists are becoming nuclear pacifists. This has been especially the case in German Protestantism where "Yes" or "No" to nuclear arms remains the explosive debate within the church. The total "No" to any reliance on nuclear weapons is voiced with drastic intensity by Heinrich Vogel of Berlin in *Um die Zukunft des Menschen im atomaren Zeitalter*, a collection of addresses focusing on the nuclear situation. Within the book, his widely known sixty Theses give the core of his stand. Several of them are:

The slogan, 'Better dead than a slave', should be replaced by 'Better dead than a mass murderer'.

The very act of dropping a hydrogen bomb is in itself — *in actu eo ipso* — an act of nihilism, which denies and betrays everything which one intends to defend and save, be it freedom and human dignity, peace and justice.

The weapons of mass annihilation subject democracy to the dictatorship of those few who decide at the critical moment as to their use.

Woe to the theologians who attempt to give a good conscience to political leaders for the production, testing, and even use of the weapons of mass annihilation, justifying what cannot be justified.

Helmut Gollwitzer's pamphlet, *Die Christen und die Atomwaffen*, also protests sharply against the theological apologetic for nuclear arms. Gollwitzer shows that the main principles of classical "just war" thinking are swept away by the weapons of mass annihilation, which make impossible a defensive war, a distinction between combatants and non-combatants, a just peace. Though the "just war" doctrine once represented the Church's effort to set moral limits on war, it at present tends to provide undergirding for "holy war" type thinking.

The emphatically non-official WCC study document, *Christians and the Prevention of War in an Atomic Age — A Theological Discussion*, sanctions the disciplined maintenance of nuclear weapons as a deterrent, but most significantly gives a total "No" to their use for all-out war, counselling even unconditional surrender instead, if necessary.

For a considerable number of American theologians in seminaries of the Boston area, the provisional WCC document stops short at an untenable position. They offer in *Proposals for the Revision of the Provisional Study Document of the World Council of Churches: "Christians and the Prevention of War in an Atomic Age"* a provocative general theological critique, and point on to a nuclear pacifist stand.

IV

Political analyses

THE CAUSES OF WORLD WAR THREE, by C. Wright Mills. Simon and Schuster, New York, 1958. 172 pp. Cloth-bound \$3.50; paper cover \$1.50. German edition: DIE KONSEQUENZ: POLITIK OHNE VERANTWORTUNG. Kindler Verlag, München, 1959. 238 pp. DM 12.—.

SPEAK TRUTH TO POWER: A QUAKER SEARCH FOR AN ALTERNATIVE TO VIOLENCE. American Friends Service Committee, 20 South 12th Street, Philadelphia 7, Penn. 71 pp., paper cover. \$0.25. This, or the German or French edition, can be ordered from Friends House, Euston Road, London, N.W. 1.

DEFENCE IN THE NUCLEAR AGE, by Commander Sir Stephen King-Hall. Victor Gollancz, London, 1958. 223 pp. 18s. Fellowship, Nyack, New York, 1959. 234 pp. \$2.75.

THE ARMS RACE, by Philip Noel-Baker. Stephens & Sons, London, 1958. 578 pp. 25s.

NEW AGE FOR PEACE. Fellowship of Reconciliation, London. Illustrated. 48 pp., paper cover. 1s. 6d.

Of special significance for Christians is C. Wright Mills' "A Pagan Sermon to the Christian Clergy", included in his book,

The Causes of World War Three. As a non-Christian earnestly looking for peace-making drive in various society groups, the Columbia University sociologist finds that religion has become "a religiously ineffective part of the show that fills up certain time slots in the weekly routine of cheerful robots". In the face of the nuclear peril, Christians generally share in mankind's tragic moral insensitivity and lack of effective opposition. The decisive test of Christianity, Mills believes, "lies in your witness of the refusal by individuals and by groups to engage in war. Pacifism, we believe, is the test of your Christianity — and of you. At the very least, it ought to be *the* debate within Christendom." He spells out proposals for replacing the "crackpot realists" now in power and for graduated unilateral disarmament. This is an angry and eloquent book.

Speak Truth to Power summarizes the political analyses basic to the world-wide peace-making of the Quakers. The pamphlet points out that, though most people in the West believe we must pursue a twin course of maintaining our military strength while carrying out long-range constructive programs, this simply is not happening. The military effort, rather than being a shield behind which positive programs of peace-making are carried on, pushes to the margin all such programs and dominates them. In the Quaker view, this is inevitable: in the contemporary world, to rely on the military is to be dominated by it. Only as individuals and groups decide for non-violence instead of violence are they financially and psychologically freed for full peace-making endeavour.

Much of the cogency of Commander Sir Stephen King-Hall's *Defence in the Nuclear Age* lies in its being so staunchly and unabashedly secular. From straight military reasoning he concludes that the only sensible policy for Great Britain is unilateral nuclear disarmament and non-violent resistance in case of invasion. This, he believes, could slow down and reverse the East-West arms race. The book has been playing a key part in the rising tide of unilateralism in Britain. The classic work on non-violence remains *The Power of Non-Violence*¹, by Richard B. Gregg.

¹ *The Power of Non-Violence*, by RICHARD B. GREGG. Fellowship, Nyack, New York, second revised edition, 1959. 192 pp. \$2.50.

In *The Arms Race*, Nobel Peace Prize winner, Philip Noel-Baker, who for more than thirty years has devoted himself to world disarmament, writes in the assumption that disarmament will only come multilaterally. The book is an elaborate threefold survey of modern arms development, disarmament negotiations, and procedures for achieving disarmament. "Why has disarmament not succeeded long ago?" asks Noel-Baker. "The governments, the general staffs, the peoples, simply have not grasped what modern armaments mean." Calmly and without recrimination he reminds us: 10-megaton H-bombs for a circle of total destruction eight miles across; psittacosis virus, a quart of which, evenly distributed, would be enough to kill seven billion human beings; and "conventional" weapons incredibly advanced over those of World War II (a present fighter could probably defeat one hundred 1945 fighters).

So clearly does Noel-Baker present the possibilities in each type of armament for evasion of inspection and control, that one is left again and again in detective-story puzzlement as to how there could be a solution. Yet for each type he points to extensive inspection procedures that could eliminate risk or make it quite small. Disarmament under tens of thousands of United Nations inspectors is technologically feasible and most definitely attainable, if the will for it really comes, and an emphasis and ingenuity comparable to that put into 300,000-part Intercontinental ballistic missiles are given it.

New Age for Peace is a most persuasive, illustrated British publication with contributions by such peacemakers as Martin Niemöller, Albert Schweitzer, Cardinal Ottaviani, and C. F. von Weizsacker.

V

Living as peacemakers

STRIDE TOWARD FREEDOM, by Martin Luther King, Jr. Harper, New York, 1958. 230 pp. \$2.95. The story of the Montgomery bus boycott and its motivating spirit, told by the leader of American Negro non-violent resistance to segregation.

- THE VOYAGE OF THE GOLDEN RULE, by Albert E. Bigelow. Doubleday, New York. 288 pp. \$3.95. The skipper's recounting of the much-publicized attempt to sail into the Eniwetok nuclear test area.
- DIARY OF A SELF-MADE CONVICT, by Alfred Hassler. Fellowship, Nyack, New York, 1958. 182 pp., paper cover. \$1.50. A perceptive day-by-day account of a pacifist editor's imprisonment as a conscientious objector in World War II.
- CHRISTIANS IN THE ARENA, by Allan A. Hunter. Fellowship, Nyack, New York, 1958. 108 pp., paper cover. \$1.50. Sketches of the reconciling lives of eight contemporary European Christians.
- MARTIN NIEMÖLLER, by Dietmar Schmidt. Rowohlt Verlag, Hamburg, 1959. 256 pp. DM 10.80. Also, Doubleday, New York, 1959, and Odhams, London, 1959. A skilful delineation of the life and personality of the controversial German rebel.
- UNTERWEGS NOTIERT, by Hans A. de Boer. J. G. Oncken Verlag, Kassel, 1959. 327 pp. DM 12.80; paper cover DM 3.80. Translated into a number of languages. A young German Christian's engrossing account of his living in South Africa and his travels on around the world.
- A TIME TO SPEAK, by Michael Scott. Doubleday, New York, 1958. 358 pp. \$4.50. An Anglican priest's story of his efforts for reconciliation and racial justice in Africa.

VI

For much more information

- BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON WAR, PACIFISM, NON-VIOLENCE AND RELATED STUDIES, compiled and edited by William Robert Miller. Fellowship, Nyack, New York, 1960. 30 pp., paper cover. \$0.25. A list of five hundred books and pamphlets in English recommended by a committee of peace leaders.

THE STUDENT WORLD CHRONICLE

AN EXIT TO FREEDOM

Events and Issues in the American Student Protest Movement

JAMESON JONES

Birth of the "sit-ins"

Of the many events in America affecting race relations in recent years, the most significant was the long-anticipated May 17, 1954, decision of the United States Supreme Court concerning the illegality of racial segregation in public schools.

The next most significant event was by far the most unexpected.

It began February 1, 1960. Joseph McNeil, age eighteen, soft-spoken and rather shy, sat at a variety-store lunch counter for ninety minutes — until the store closed. Neither Joseph McNeil nor his companions had any idea that the consequences would turn out as they did.

McNeil himself was born and raised in Wilmington, North Carolina, the son of a floor waxer. He had seen a documentary film on the life of Gandhi. He had heard about the successful non-violent protest of Montgomery, Alabama, Negroes against bus segregation there. According to the *New Republic*, he was directly influenced by a "comic book" — evidently "Martin Luther King and the Montgomery Story", a graphic presentation of non-violence and how it works, published by the American Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Joseph McNeil and three other freshmen students at the all-Negro Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina, in Greensboro, worked out a plan to witness against segregation. "The four of us bought some toothpaste and saved the receipts", he said. "Then we sat down at the lunch counter. For five or ten minutes we were ignored, and then the waitress said, 'Go to the stand-up counter. We don't serve Negroes here'. We said, 'But four feet away from here we bought toothpaste'. We asked to see the manager, but he wasn't around. Then one middle-aged white lady sat beside us and said, 'You're right, boys. You should have done this a long time ago'. That gave us all the confidence we needed. We knew then we'd stay."

And they did. On the A and T campus, a student sit-in committee was formed that night. On following days, students returned to the variety store in larger numbers. A major student sit-in movement began in Durham, North Carolina, on February 10, joint action of a group of Negro students from North Carolina College and white students from Duke University. They entered a variety store when it opened, and politely but unsuccessfully tried to purchase coffee. By the middle of February, sit-in demonstrations had spread to seven cities in North Carolina, and, like the flames of a dry-grass fire, had leaped to Tennessee, Florida, Virginia, West Virginia, Georgia, and South Carolina. Sympathy demonstrations took place in major cities and universities across the rest of the United States.

Historical background

For the sake of readers unfamiliar with the American scene, let us pause for some background information.

The present situation is a consequence of an event in 1619, when a Dutch ship cast anchor off Jamestown in the New World, and sold the Virginia colonists many items, among them "twenty negurs". In their wake travelled New England shipmasters, who for a hundred years carried rum to Africa, slaves from there to southern United States ports, molasses from there to New England for the manufacture of more rum. Slavery became a foundation stone of southern life, particularly its economy. As everyone knows, slave labour made possible a unique way of life, a way not even totally changed by the War Between the States which resulted in the legal freeing of the slaves. The War Between the States demanded of all Americans a price of four years of blood and agony a century ago, but the southern states paid not only that price, but ten years of military occupation, thirty years of poverty and grinding toil, and ninety years of harassment, anxiety, frustration, and moral confusion.

When federal troops withdrew from the South in 1877, Negroes were abandoned as wards of the whole nation, and the problem of the freed slaves was left largely to the South to solve as it would. The terms of the solution are generally known. By the early years of the twentieth century, it was increasingly clear that the Negro would be effectively denied the right to vote, would be denied economic opportunity equal with that of white persons, and would be restricted in his comings and goings so that in fact there would be neither equality nor hope for equality in any area of his living in the world dominated by whites. The public symbols and constant reminder of this status were the "Jim Crow" laws of racial segrega-

tion. Segregation, either by law or of custom, extended to churches and schools, to housing and jobs, to eating and drinking — eventually to all forms of public transportation, athletics and recreation, hospitals, prisons, institutions for the insane, to mortuaries and cemeteries.

The South has gone through waves of change, an era of violent racism giving way to periods of peaceful progress, and back again. No one can find a rational basis for existing conditions or for changes. Factors are ordinarily a combination of economics and political pressure, coupled with national and international affairs and the strong voice of conscience. The role of the Church varies in significance.

The sit-in demonstrations of 1960 have introduced another period of change. Factors are again the same, a mixture of economics and politics, of national and international affairs, of conscience, and of faith. No one can understand the need for sit-in demonstrations apart from a thorough knowledge of the South and its people, as they have climbed with pain and error into each new decade of the twentieth century. Even today in the South, one still hears the ancient but false stereotypes concerning the Negro, that he is basically inferior, either in native ability or morals, or that he is an intruder in the American scene. Some southerners are guilty of a malicious kind of biblical exegesis that attempts to prove that God himself ordained racial segregation, or even "cursed" the forefathers of the coloured peoples, and that their colour is the consequence of God's displeasure. Incredible though such statements may be, the outsider should remember that all too many persons find them both credible and useful.

Methods of promoting change

In the face of such a situation, American Negroes have long been involved in a drive towards justice. For years, their leaders have declared that God, in his creation, and the Constitution of the United States, in its founding of a nation, have granted them full citizenship, freedom, and dignity. They have sought through various means to achieve the justice to which the laws of God and of their nation entitle them. Largely, the battle has been in the court room, where, with patience and legal skill, their leaders can bring change. But this road to change is long and slow.

In the area of change, the Negro community in the South faces two major issues. The first is method. Fortunately, no serious leader of the Negro community has advocated violence or open revolution as the way to bring change. The ballot box has been a legal and

sometimes effective way to bring change, but generally Negro voting has had little effect either because of apathy or, more likely, because the ballot has been denied to Negroes through illegal or highly questionable tactics. In recent years, the most generally accepted method has been the series of suits and test cases, bringing slow but steady victory through court decisions.

The newest and most dramatic method to be applied in the American scene is non-violence. Gandhi applied the method on the largest scale in this century. Martin Luther King and his associates pioneered in its application in America, bringing change to Montgomery, Alabama. After success in Montgomery, Negro leaders formed a Southern Christian Leadership Conference, offering guidance and resources to persons in the South who want to apply the method of non-violent action in their own cities. In several cities across the South, Negro leaders were at work in training sessions, workshops, organizational meetings, negotiations with white business men and community leaders, seeking to bring change in the midst of old patterns of segregation.

When the sit-ins first began, many Negro leaders opposed the method, believing that their efforts should be restricted to the courts. Before Montgomery, almost everyone questioned the effectiveness of non-violent demonstration, but since Montgomery and the sit-ins, practically no one questions the effectiveness of the method.

The article by Herluf Jensen in *Federation News*, May 1960, indicated the depth of the rigorous discipline of non-violence followed by the student demonstrators. According to their self-imposed discipline, demonstrators never struck back or spoke harshly, even in the face of severe abuse. They were friendly and courteous at all times. Students who could not maintain the discipline were told that they could help the demonstration by staying away. The motivation of non-violence is Christian love, the method is that of the cross, the consequence electrifying to the whole world.

The speed of change

The second major issue is a related one, that of speed. Many in the Negro community are willing to wait patiently for changes to come, are willing to live according to the expectations of the dominant white community. These persons fear that any quick action might have serious consequences, bring the wrath of the dominant white community upon their heads, and so upset the peace of the *status quo*. "Slow down", is their cry.

For many of the white community who consider themselves liberals, speed is also an issue. While they favour eventual desegregation, they want it to come slowly, so as to avoid all difficulty and every possible threat of violence. "Slow down", is their cry also, uttered in friendship, they say, because their goals are the same. Their disagreement is with the timetable. Many church leaders in the South are in this group.

Students who have participated in sit-in demonstrations are speaking quite clearly to this issue. Both to the whites in power and to Negroes in their own community, they are calling for speed and action. Again and again the students have said, "Things are going too slowly".

Sit-ins have hastened the speed of change.

The economics of segregation and integration

In the face of sit-ins, the merchant and business man has answered in terms of his major issue, economics. Whenever merchants were approached about racial integration of facilities, as in Nashville, Tennessee, months before any sit-ins, the merchants responded that the only issue was the economic one. They said they could not risk the possible loss of white trade, which might occur after racial integration. Nashville Negro leaders expressed a belief that business would actually increase after integration, but they were denied the opportunity of proving their belief. So they worked to demonstrate another point: that with segregated lunch counters as they are, business will be worse than ever.

So, Negro professors and economists from Fisk University brought charts and statistics into mass meetings of Nashville Negroes, indicating that while Negroes do not provide the majority of business for Nashville's merchants, they do control the difference between profit and loss. They never used the word "boycott", but talked about "economic withdrawal from evil". Their clergymen preached on Old Testament texts about God himself withdrawing from his people (Hosea 5:6, for example) and talked about stewardship and a right use of possessions. The Negro withdrawal from down-town Nashville was ninety to ninety-eight per cent effective. The manager of one variety store admitted that his business declined sixty per cent. Other factors — such as whites staying out of down town, some few in sympathy with the movement, a large number for fear of demonstrations or violence, also bad weather — kept business down. Merchants were now faced with a definite situation in which they were losing money, as compared with a theoretical assumption that had not yet

been proved. Rather than continue segregation and certain economic loss, they were willing to integrate lunch counters and hope for profit.

In Nashville, all down-town lunch counters were integrated according to a carefully arranged plan, and without any violence or unfortunate incident of any kind.

By the middle of August, when executives of major variety store chains met with U. S. Attorney General William P. Rogers, they told him that racial segregation had been ended at lunch counters in their stores in sixty-nine southern towns. The executives said that in more than seventy per cent of the communities, integration came without sit-in demonstrations and largely without publicity. At the same time, the Southern Regional Council, an organization of white and Negro southerners seeking to advance equal opportunity for all the South's people, could count only twenty-eight cities. Not one incident had been reported in any of the cities, and no store had reported a loss in business from white patrons. In late August and early September, more and more announcements heralded change across the South. A firm which operates restaurants in bus terminals in five southern states desegregated all its restaurants simultaneously. Many towns seemed anxious to open up their lunch counters before students returned for the fall term, lest they begin immediately to demonstrate. By the end of the summer, many merchants had learned that the sit-ins were not a passing fad but part of a long-term commitment to justice and equality, in which students who had begun the movement were united with the adult Negro community and a growing number of white friends.

The issue of law

The most difficult major issue is one still unsettled, the issue of law. The basic issue is whether the owner of a private business inviting customers from the general public has a right to restrict parts of the public from the use of parts of his business. Former President Harry S. Truman, in a spontaneous statement, sided with those who believe that a merchant can serve whomever he wishes to serve, and refuse service to others. These emphasize the private nature of even a public business. On the other side are persons who claim that a public business is for all the public, and so long as a merchant opens his doors to the public, he must serve all the public — so long as persons come with honest intent of doing business, pay their bills, are dressed decently, and conduct themselves in an orderly manner. The Negro has protested against the incongruous situation

in which his money is welcomed at all other counters of a store, but refused at a lunch counter (unless he is willing to stand while eating, or, in some cases, to carry his food outside the store before he eats it). English Common Law, say some Negro attorneys, is relevant to the present situation. Common Law preceded written civil law by centuries, and is a valid part of the American legal heritage. One of its provisions pertained specifically to innkeepers, and declared that an innkeeper must serve any person who was willing to pay, so long as the person met basic requirements of decent dress, sober conduct, and general courtesy. That provision was followed in America, until in southern regions, innkeepers and other merchants became concerned about the meaning of such a law for the service of persons of minority racial groups. So state and local laws arose, aimed directly at circumventing or thwarting the Common Law. Some Negro attorneys in the South believe that any cases about lunch-counter segregation, when brought through the federal court system, will result in verdicts in keeping with Common Law.

Thus, what may appear as law because of state or local ordinances, may not be law at all in terms of federal law. This the courts have yet to decide.

Confusion about law becomes painfully obvious in the Nashville, Tennessee, situation. There, no law exists that prohibits Negroes and whites from eating together (though such a law has been passed in other southern states). On the day of the first Nashville sit-ins, police told store managers that they could not interfere unless there were incidents. Police told sit-in leaders that the only applicable law was one pertaining to disorderly conduct. The mayor of Nashville told merchants that, after consultation with his attorneys, the opinion was that as long as their business was open to the public, any member of the public had a right to come in and request service, and the mayor could not interfere with this right. He also said it was their opinion that a law is broken when anyone insists on remaining seated at lunch counters after they have been closed to all members of the public.

When Nashville students were arrested for sitting-in, the charge was that of loitering and disorderly conduct. In court, loitering charges were dropped immediately, and seventy-nine students were convicted for disorderly conduct. This was a city court, and the cases have all been appealed. Later, the same students were arrested again on charges of unlawful conspiracy to commit acts injurious to public trade and commerce. The validity of this law for the sit-in cases will depend on the court's interpretation of it and on the effectiveness of the students' defence against it. The students maintain

that they did not intend to harm or disrupt business, but instead to increase it. They say they sat at the counters to buy food, and not to stop anyone else from doing so.

In community after community, any court cases have been postponed and few trials actually held. Many cases have been dismissed for one reason or another. Where there have been convictions, they have been appealed to a higher court. The whole legal issue is far from settled, and the debate over it still continues.

The role of the university in society

For the Student Christian Movement, one of its favourite topics is once again a major issue. Real discussion is taking place in America now, concerning the nature and role of a university, both internally in its educational task, and externally in its relation to culture and the world at large. Students are grappling with the problem of the university's relation to society and the culture around it — whether the university is to be a mirror reflecting the values and standards of society, or to be a changer and transformer. They are asking about the meaning of freedom, both for an institution itself and for the individual administrator, faculty person, or student.

In the early days of the sit-in demonstrations, state institutions in the South revealed how strong is the control of the state over their affairs. Privately owned and church-related institutions in the same states often displayed a freedom that state-supported institutions did not have. In the minds of many, the opportunity for a church-related institution to be prophetic, in the biblical sense, gave these schools a real reason for being. However, these church-related and independent schools depend for the bulk of their financial support on individuals and business men who control large funds. These persons and companies have been generous in providing funds, but it became obvious in this situation that these same persons often exercise tremendous control over the institution, because of their financial support. In some cases, it is clear that business men are controlling education beyond their ability to do so, and without adequate consultation with responsible educators, either administrators or faculty. Educators are asking anew, how can they provide needed financial support for their institutions without surrendering the freedom they must have for responsible and creative education. In many ways, this problem is peculiar to the American scene, but it does raise questions pertinent to education everywhere.

Now, in brief, seven general comments on the events and issues in the American student protest movement :

1. The movement began as a student movement. Four freshmen in Greensboro, North Carolina, were the spark that ignited the whole South and initiated the movement. In every locality, students led the way.

2. Very soon, however, students were joined by senior friends and counsellors, resulting in a new unity in the Negro people. Some observers say there is a more mature and authentic unity among American Negroes than ever before. Mass meetings of Negroes draw a cross-section of the people — office workers and merchants, maids and day labourers, professors, doctors, students, and the retired. The movement is not solely a student movement.

3. The Negro community has demonstrated once again the power of a committed minority. Spiritually, economically, politically, they have power and will use it with increasing effectiveness. Some Negroes are just as surprised at their power as many whites, but they know now they have it.

4. The Negro community is not alone in the movement. With courage and prophetic insight, many white persons have made their witness side by side with Negro brothers.

On the student level, white students have frequently been part of the sit-in demonstrations. White students have often supported the movement in various ways, without actually sitting-in. Outside the South, students on many campuses have acted in support of the southern movement — either with sympathy demonstrations, in active opposition to discrimination on their own campuses or in their own communities, or in raising funds for fines and legal aid. More and more observers have said, this is not a "silent generation" of students, but only a generation that has been waiting for the right time to speak.

Also, there is a significant minority of white persons in the South and across America who have worked patiently and often effectively to bring about justice and integration. Though small in number, this group of white persons generally represents an educated, able, and significant level of leadership.

5. The protest movement operates from a Christian base. Most of the adult leadership has come from ordained ministers ; the meeting places for mass rallies are churches, and the inspiration to keep going comes from worship and the proclamation of God's Word.

Apart from the Christian declaration of love and brotherhood, the movement would be nothing. It is a Christian movement, expressed in sermon and hymn, in scripture and prayer, in the faith that unites God's people. The gospel of love and reconciliation is proclaimed among all men. There is a vitality of faith and witness that reveals power, born not of hatred or envy, but of love and concern that all men might be free under God to live and eat in harmony together.

6. The method of non-violent action as an effective and Christian method for achieving social change has won widespread approval. We will see more of it. Already the movement has spread to public libraries, art galleries, even segregated churches.

7. Dean Walter Muelder of the Boston University School of Theology has said that this student generation in America has come alive on three of mankind's most fundamental questions: the solidarity of the human race which transcends colour; the freedoms of the bill of rights which make democratic life effective, and the threat of annihilation through nuclear weapons.

Certainly this student generation is experiencing a new and sudden awakening. From the depths of bondage, in which Negroes have seen nothing but a blank wall, there has appeared a new exit to freedom. Pointing to that exit is a Student Christian Movement, raising key questions, witnessing to Christian answers, acting where the spirit of a reconciling Christ would lead them.

The National Student Christian Federation, denominational student movements, campus fellowships, individual Christians are alert and active in the midst of an historic era. The story is not yet over, and will not be over, until a new vision of the Kingdom of God is more fully made real among us.

AFRICAN TRAVEL DIARY

INGA-BRITA CASTRÉN

My visit to Africa was the first by an African Secretary of the WSCF, and everywhere I went I was welcomed with great friendship. I visited twelve African countries in four and one-half months (January-May 1960). Somewhere a missionary said to me, certainly with some justification: "So you have now been skating on the surface of Africa for nearly five months!" However, I never saw, in that tropical heat, any spot of ice, which I, as a Finn, would certainly have welcomed!

But I did have to move more or less "on the surface of Africa", and this, while it did not make me an expert, did give me a kind of over-all view. More and more, Africa is becoming a continent which must be looked at as a whole. "Pan-Africanism" influences all work and nearly all realms of life in Africa today. It is somewhat artificial, and even dangerous, to divide it into West, Central, Southern, and Eastern Africa, and I have done this mainly for clarity.

WEST AFRICA

Dakar, January 5-9

I left Geneva on a cold winter day, coming down in less than twenty-four hours in the heat of Dakar. The University of Dakar, inaugurated in December 1959, is the only one in French-speaking West Africa. Its modern buildings, in bright colours, many of them still under construction, are impressive, and its situation near the sea is lovely. Its students live very pleasantly, and there are even hostels for married couples. Students usually get large scholarships which cover all their expenses and leave quite an amount for pocket money.

In January about 1,400 students from the whole of French-speaking West Africa were enrolled; about 200 Roman Catholics, thirteen Protestants, and all the rest Muslims. This gives some picture of the work and problems of the small SCM group (and indeed also a picture of the northern part of West Africa). It is not even very homogeneous, as these thirteen Protestant students come from Dahomey (eight), Sudan, Sierra Leone, and Switzerland. It is trying to build up an SCM program, with the help of CIMADE, but it is

only in the beginning. Its religious life seems to be rather isolated from that of the rest of the university : it has little contact with the Roman Catholic group, which has a well-organized and lively program, and no confrontation with the Muslim students. However, the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity in January has for some years been celebrated together with the Catholics, and I had the impression that, perhaps if there were more contact with these students, it would help to overcome the situation of "non-encounter" between Christians and Muslims which certainly exists today in the University of Dakar. But the Protestant students need much help if they are to be ready for such an encounter, and they also need to be deeply rooted in the life of the Church as expressed in the local parish. The CIMADE team, whose work is above all a "witnessing through presence", seems to have a remarkable amount of genuine contact with the Muslims.

Christian student work at the University of Dakar is very crucial for the whole of French-speaking West Africa, for here most of its future leaders are educated. But the small SCM there certainly needs help. In the future a Protestant student chaplain or a travelling secretary for the SCM in all French-speaking West Africa may be needed to support it in its work. And the many "ecumenical travellers" who pass through Dakar should not forget to visit the small *Fédé* there, to give it inspiration and some sense of belonging to a large ecumenical community.

Sierra Leone, January 9-16

I was a whole week in Sierra Leone. While in Freetown I stayed in the home of our friends, Rena and John Karefa-Smart, who have given such invaluable help, not only to SCM work in Sierra Leone and Africa, but to the WSCF as a whole. It was a great gift to live in a family with so many contacts and precious insights into the problems of Africa today.

Christian student work in Sierra Leone has grown greatly during the last years. There are now local branches at Fourah Bay College (which got its "Charter" at the end of January), three teacher training colleges, and ten secondary schools, with a clear distinction made between work at the university and the high school level. The Senior Friends group, including both Africans and Europeans, has a solid study program and other activities.

For the first time, the SCM of Sierra Leone has for the last year had a full-time travelling secretary, Lawrence Rogerson, a Sierra Leonean. It is easy to see what it means for an SCM when someone

gives all his time and thought to the work, especially with the faithfulness and devotion which Lawrence Rogerson has shown. In Africa today there are few Christian leaders, and all of them are overwhelmed with work and many responsibilities.

Sierra Leone is rapidly preparing itself for independence, which is due on April 27, 1961. It has its problems — tension between the Creoles and the tribes, economic questions, etc. — but the future looks promising.

The strength of Islam is growing. The Christian witness is not always united; there are difficulties with some conservative groups, which are sometimes, though not often, reflected in student work.

Liberia, January 16-21

Liberia, the oldest independent country in West Africa, received me in an impressive way: a real delegation from the YMCA, YWCA, and the National Student Christian Council was at the Roberts Field airport, with even a movie camera! Thus from the very beginning I experienced that marvellous Liberian hospitality, which was later shown to me in many Liberian homes, where I tasted real Liberian food and enjoyed the fellowship.

The work of the YWCA and YMCA in Liberia, which includes that of the National Student Christian Council (the Student YMCA and YWCA), is remarkable; one gets the impression that it has a genuine influence on the life of the whole society. It also has a real hold on the young boys and girls, under equally young but enthusiastic and qualified leaders, like the SCM secretary, Yancy Peters. The NSCC seems also to have a positive and even creative relationship with the churches; the United Christian Fellowship Conference (a loose, co-operative body, not yet a real Council of Churches), at the suggestion of the NSCC, took as its subject for study for last year "The Life and Mission of the Church". The NSCC has well planned annual conferences, and there are "Hi-Y" and "Y-Teen" groups in practically all the secondary schools. The weakest point in the work seems to be the University of Liberia in Monrovia, but there is great hope that Robert Geller, the new SCM secretary in Sierra Leone, will be able to help some here.

Unfortunately, my visit to Liberia occurred during the university and schools vacation. My program consisted largely of meeting people (and this I did up to the governmental, even presidential, level!), though there were also some meetings. I visited Cuttington College (Methodist and Episcopalian with some Lutheran co-operation), and was very impressed by its work and its high standards,

especially in its theological faculty, one of the few places in West Africa which gives academic theological training, for which there is such urgent need in Africa today. But there is unfortunately a great lack of theological students: Burgess Carr, one of the Vice-Chairmen of the Federation, is the only one at present. It is part of the task of the SCM to challenge students to prepare themselves for full-time, well-trained ministry in the churches.

Ivory Coast, January 21-23

My second French-speaking country in West Africa was Ivory Coast, also newly independent. It has a rather peculiar Christian history. At the beginning of this century, a Liberian, the Prophet Harris, came to preach the gospel to the people, made them burn their fetiches, left them with a closed Bible, and said they must wait for the coming of the missionaries. After ten years, the Methodists came, and their mission is still the main one working in Ivory Coast.

While the *Fédé* of Ivory Coast is necessarily small, as there are not many secondary schools, it is growing, and I was much encouraged by its well-planned work: it has a constitution, a magazine, *Cossou* (mimeographed), and five local groups. There are the beginnings of some university faculties in Abidjan, and the *Fédé* is planning to start work among the students there as soon as possible. As everywhere in Africa, the great need is for leadership.

Ghana, January 23-28

Ghana was the only African country in which I had been before, but as I approached it (in the same plane as Billy Graham and his team), it was a rather big question mark, as I had had no answer to my several letters except, just before my departure from Abidjan, a telegram saying, "Meeting you in Accra Hicks". I had no idea who this Hicks could be (he turned out to be one of the new members of the SCM Executive). There was quite a delegation at the airport, mixed in with the enormous crowd, choir, and orchestra welcoming Billy Graham.

I was cared for, during my whole stay in Ghana, in an excellent way, mainly by the new travelling secretary, the Rev. Ernest Stafford, from Gambia. The "great silence" in Ghana had resulted very understandably from a change in travelling secretaries and in the Executive Committee. It certainly did not mean that the SCM in Ghana was silent or dead, and this I very soon realized as I travelled with Ernest Stafford for five days, visiting Cape Coast, Akropong, Aburi,

the University of Legon, and Accra. Everywhere there was enthusiasm and vitality, especially in the secondary school groups which had been growing rapidly during the last year. After the tragic illness and death of Ben Adade, the first travelling secretary, Ernest Stafford has taken over with a keen interest in the work and a real gift for making contact with young people and inspiring them. He is a great blessing to the Ghana SCM. Here again, as in Sierra Leone, it was evident what full-time staff means for the work of a Movement. The SCM now has, in addition to the university branch, forty-seven local groups in secondary schools and teacher training colleges, divided into five regions. It also has many Senior Friends who give much support to the work, and one evening, at the university, I met a group of about thirty of them.

Though I was in Ghana at the same time as Billy Graham, I was unable to attend any of his enormous meetings. However, I heard that at the end of the meetings the Muslims were distributing their literature to the great crowds. Islam is very active in West Africa, especially through *Ahmadyan*, the posters which can be seen everywhere.

Togo, January 28-February 1

When I arrived in Togo, our friend and correspondent, the Rev. Eilfried Kpotsra, was away travelling in the country. However, I later met him at the *Mission Protestante* where I stayed, and got a glimpse of his extremely busy life as secretary of the Synod, of the *Equipes Unionistes*, and of the SCM. At present, he is the only African with academic theological training in Togo, but at least three others are now studying theology in France and will return to Togo in the coming years.

The small SCM in Togo really began in 1958 after the WSCF Leadership Training Course in Aburi, in which Kpotsra and two students took part. There is now an SCM group of about twenty in the *Lycée* at Lomé and the beginnings of a group at the *Cours Complémentaire*. These two groups met in Lomé while I was there, and we had a very good Sunday afternoon together. They were especially interested in what is happening in other Student Christian Movements around the world. Last year, they organized a very successful camp at Agu, and hope to do the same again. They meet every two weeks either for Bible study or discussion (on marriage, various professions, etc.).

My visit in Togo and in the other French-speaking countries of West Africa has convinced me that the growing SCM work there

must not become isolated from other Christian youth work or from church work in general. It is essential that this be kept seriously in mind. Quite new structures for Christian student work may have to be evolved. However, I am also convinced that there is a real need for specific student work. Christian students have their own problems and tremendous responsibilities in these new countries, and as new schools and universities are established, they will need the work and witness of Christian student groups.

Dahomey, February 1-11

Christian student work in Dahomey began in 1952 as a GBU (IVF), but in 1955 it became an SCM. Harry Henry is its secretary, and after April 1960 he was also to be the full-time secretary of the Methodist Youth Movement. Here again is an SCM leader with many other responsibilities, but he has the help not only of Amos Adjakou, the General Secretary, but also of several Senior Friends. There are also some very active students in the groups at the various educational institutions.

When I was in Dahomey, the *Collège Technique* in Cotonou was closed "for reasons of discipline", quite a common occurrence in present-day Africa, as I later came to realize. Strong nationalism, sometimes combined with foreign elements, can take a rather revolutionary and unbalanced form among young people in schools. However, I did not feel this in the general atmosphere in Dahomey. The growth of Islam is everywhere evident, and the Roman Catholic Church is the largest in numbers.

From Dahomey I travelled to Nigeria, but unfortunately my program there had to be cancelled because of illness. I was able to get only some glimpses of the strong Nigerian SCM, our largest member Movement in West Africa, which has an especially active branch at the university in Ibadan.

Congo (ex-French), February 24-29

In Brazzaville, I was received by the Rev. Carl-Eric Ahlden from the Swedish Covenant Mission, whom we had known for many years through correspondence. It was wonderful to live in a Swedish household for a few days, eat Swedish food and drink Swedish coffee — I felt very close to Finland! Mr. Ahlden has worked for twenty-two years in Congo, so he has a real knowledge of the country, as have many of his Swedish colleagues, whom I also met in the Mission, and some of whose work I saw in its schools in Brazzaville and in the

crowded church in Poto-Poto. The Swedish Covenant Mission is practically the only Protestant mission working in the Congo. There are not yet any African pastors with university training, but some are now studying in France and Sweden. The Catholic mission is larger. The presence of Islam is not (yet ?) as strongly felt as in many northern parts of West Africa.

There is still very little higher education in the *République du Congo*, but it is certainly increasing. Mr. Ahlden emphasized that today, in contrast with the past, many girls, especially those encouraged by their parents and fiancés, are wanting more and more education. The proper conception of marriage is discussed everywhere. There is as yet no SCM, but Mr. Ahlden has definite plans to begin such work.

Some impressions

Before going from West to Central Africa, I want to summarize briefly some of my impressions and raise some questions concerning Christian student work in West Africa.

A visit to the West African SCMs is in many ways a most encouraging experience. There has been in recent years an obvious growth in the work in most of these countries. We realize with special gratitude that our Leadership Training Course in Aburi in 1958 has meant much for the strengthening of Christian witness among students in West Africa. Political changes in this part of the world are taking place with tremendous rapidity, as one country after another gains its independence and has to face totally new and enormous problems and tasks. Every student is urgently needed by his country. Christian students and graduates have a most exciting and demanding task in their countries in helping to build true democracies and in showing what Christian responsibility and citizenship mean. There must be sincere study and searching for what it means to be a Christian student and graduate in all realms of life in Africa today. Christians in West Africa are everywhere a minority, but they can be a dynamic, creative minority. But if they are to be so, united action and witness is needed, founded on the Bible and life in the Church — the local church and the Church as a world-wide reality.

And now a few basic questions connected with the future development of Christian student work in West Africa.

1. Leadership and leadership training are, as I have said, crucial questions, and this calls for a continuous program of training and study. A Bible study seminar would be of the greatest value and

significance. When SCMs train leaders for their own work, they are at the same time preparing responsible lay members for the churches.

In all the English-speaking countries (except Liberia), where the work is clearly much further developed than in French-speaking West Africa, there are now full-time travelling secretaries, and this has meant much for SCM work. In its Ecumenical Assistance Program, the WSCF should give priority to helping young Movements (or regions) to get full-time secretaries, with the understanding that in time these Movements will find the means to finance their own staff. None of the French-speaking West African SCMs has a full-time secretary, and I believe the time has come to try to help these young Movements in this way, possibly through a regional appointment made perhaps together with the churches or other Christian organizations.

2. It is of vital importance that new Christian student work be built up and developed in close co-operation with the churches and other Christian organizations. New structures may be needed, but there is absolutely no place for distrust, rivalry, or separation. One of the tasks of the SCMs is to put before their students the challenge of the vocation of well-trained, full-time ministry in the churches, which are in danger of losing contact with the educated class. This would be fatal in a time when new nations are being built. They must also try to encourage confidence and respect among Christian students for the work done by the missions. There has been and must be much fresh creative criticism, but this must be combined with a sense of solidarity. The more I travelled, the more I came to admire the fine work done by the missions.

3. The encounter with Islam is much in the minds of the International Missionary Council and the World Council of Churches, and Christian students in West Africa, who are in key positions for this encounter, must certainly make use of their work and findings. But they need much help and preparation, perhaps in the form of a study seminar or course on Islam.

4. SCM work is stronger and more vital in secondary schools and teacher training colleges than in the universities; Ibadan is perhaps an exception. There may not always have been enough emphasis on the distinction between work at these different levels. A consultation on work in universities may be needed.

In conclusion, I want to say that these are certainly not my "personal recommendations", but points that came up again and again in discussions with our West African friends. I am convinced

that the WSCF must not try to build up a program, but that the work must be left in the hands of the West African Movements, which have already shown themselves to be vital and creative, and have given much inspiration and encouragement to the WSCF, and through it to Christian students everywhere.

CENTRAL AFRICA

Leopoldville, February 24-29

The atmosphere in the *République du Congo* was, at least in Brazzaville, still very typically French. This changed somewhat as we crossed the large Congo River to Leopoldville, at that time still capital of the *Congo Belge*. Even from Brazzaville, the high impressive buildings of Leopoldville can be distinguished. And when you enter it, you find what is perhaps the most elegant and modern city in the whole of West and Central Africa, with large avenues, many green trees and parks, fine new houses, and even some skyscrapers. The African part of the city is also very well built.

My discussions in Leopoldville were mainly with the Rev. de Carle-Thompson, secretary of the *Conseil Protestant du Congo*, which has left the International Missionary Council because of the planned integration with the World Council of Churches. However, Mr. de Carle-Thompson spoke of the work of the WSCF in Africa with great friendliness and understanding, promising to give it all his support and help in the future. There have been so few institutions of higher education in the Belgian Congo that it has not been possible to think of Christian student work, but two Protestant secondary schools in Kimpesi and Katubue are soon to be raised to university level.

The *Conseil Protestant* was founded in 1902 and is thus the oldest council of missions in Africa. In 1946, it became a council of missions and churches, and in 1960 a council of churches where missions are represented but without a vote. It has also decided to elect an African as *secrétaire-général adjoint*. In the light of recent developments in the Congo, it is clear that this reorganization came none too soon! When I was there in February, there were about 2,500 Protestant missionaries in 330 stations. The total number of Roman Catholic Christians was about six million and of Protestants two and a half million.

Mr. de Carle-Thompson told me of the Protestant theological faculty which was to be opened in Elisabethville in September 1960. He also said that certain American missions were very eager to start

a completely new Evangelical University in Congo, somewhere in the country. A commission had been set up to further this plan.

I also paid a brief visit to Lovanium University. Though it is officially Roman Catholic, it has at present two Protestant students and is prepared to take more in the future.

Southern Rhodesia, March-April

My home base from March to May was the Partridge home in Hope Fountain (London Missionary Society) near Bulawayo, Southern Rhodesia. The Partridges are a lovely family and wonderful SCM friends who for years have given all their spare time to building up the Movement in Southern Rhodesia. Nan Partridge was formerly a travelling secretary of the Australian SCM. As a result of her faithful work, there are many SCM groups in and around Bulawayo. I think I visited all of them — about fifteen altogether. There was also a three-day week-end SCM conference and a Senior Friends meeting. I attended the Southern Rhodesia Christian Conference meeting in Bulawayo (April 20-22), where I took part in the commission on Sunday school and youth work and brought greetings from the WSCF in plenary. The commission report supported the creation of a national SCM.

I also was privileged to participate in the first national conference of the new Southern Rhodesian YWCA in Gwelo (April 23-24). It was one of my most inspiring experiences in Rhodesia: a totally interracial conference, led by African women in an atmosphere of joy and love, as they felt the movement was really their own.

I visited the University of Salisbury twice. I met with both the Student Christian Fellowship and the newly organized Christian professors' group, participated in a meeting at the university on "Christian Witness in Schools and Universities", with about 150 present, visited some schools, and joined in a meeting of the SCM committee. While schools and most public institutions are still segregated, the university is interracial. There were 220 students, of whom sixty were Africans. Africans and Europeans live in the same residence halls but in separate corridors; they eat in the same dining-room but often at separate tables.

At the university there is a Roman Catholic student society, an Anglican society, and the Student Christian Fellowship, all of which work completely separately. The Student Christian Fellowship, which has more or less grown from the Scripture Union¹ work in

¹ The Scripture Union, originating in Great Britain, is a Christian youth movement working in somewhat the same spirit as does the IVF in the student world. It emphasizes primarily personal conversion and prayer.

schools, had at the time of my visit twenty-two members, among whom I did not see any Africans. They have a strong program of Bible study and prayer, and concentrate on "personal problems" with little emphasis on what Christian faith and the Lordship of Christ mean in all realms of life. The Student Christian Fellowship has no official international contacts, and emphasizes that it does not see their value and its fear that such contacts might result in a split in the group.

As I have said, there is now a teachers' Christian group at the university consisting mainly of SCM Senior Friends from Great Britain. There are many Senior Friends throughout the whole Central African Federation, who would be very willing to help in building up a national Student Christian Movement. The danger may be the creation of a Rhodesian SCM simply as an imitation of the British Movement. And Africa may need something which is neither a British SCM nor a Finnish one! Tradition can sometimes be a handicap in circumstances where it may be possible to start from the very beginning in new ways.

Elisabethville, May 5-8

I visited Elisabethville, the capital of Katanga, when it was still a province of the Belgian Congo. The atmosphere was rather tense, and the city was full of strikes. The trade unions had asked their members to strike while the Europeans were still in leading positions, since later it would not be worthwhile! All the church leaders and missionaries whom I met were sure there would be bloodshed when independence came at the beginning of July, especially between the tribes (there are almost 300 tribes and languages). Party adherence in Elisabethville is almost entirely according to tribes. They also said that they did not think the Belgian Congo would remain a political entity, and that the influence of communism was strong.

The State University in Elisabethville opened three years ago. It has as yet no buildings of its own, but is scattered in different parts of the city. There are about 150 students, the majority Europeans, but with a good proportion of Africans.

The Protestant student group is mainly African. There was one European Greek-Orthodox who said he would like to start a Greek Orthodox student group which would co-operate with the SCM! The atmosphere in the group was very good: the students are open, interested in world questions, and longing for outside contacts. They asked about the possibility of affiliating with the WSCF, as they plan to begin a real SCM. They already had plans to start work also in some schools. We had hoped to have one of the students,

Joseph Katanga, with us at the World Teaching Conference in Strasbourg, but because of the unfortunate developments in Congo, all our contacts with the Protestant student group have been broken since July.

Northern Rhodesia, May 2-10

There are already the beginnings of a national SCM in Northern Rhodesia : they have seven well-established groups of which I met three. For many years the key man for SCM work here has been the Rev. Peter Musgrove, secretary of the Christian Council. Unfortunately he will leave for Australia at the end of this year, but an ex-secretary of the British SCM will soon be going to work in Kitwe. The Paris mission, working in Barotseland, is also very keen to build up the SCM there.

The Mindolo Ecumenical Centre, led by the Rev. Peter Mathews, is one of the most inspiring and encouraging developments I have seen in the churches in Africa. It was begun some three years ago and has grown with almost incredible speed, serving as a women's training centre, a literature centre, and a laymen's centre — really an "Evangelical Academy". It is above all a place where the problems and challenges facing the new Africa can be studied in a Christian perspective. It is a real miracle and holds great promise for the future. The WSCF will be privileged to hold its first Leadership Training Course in Central Africa in Mindolo next January.

All thinking Christians in Northern Rhodesia have a great sense of the urgency of the work and of the very critical time through which Northern Rhodesia is now going. While I was there some of the African schools were closed because of different forms of rioting which had occurred in them. The political atmosphere was much more tense than in Southern Rhodesia, or at least the tension was more obvious. The day I passed through N'dola, a European woman was burned in her car when some Africans threw petrol on it.

The atmosphere in the whole Central African Federation is totally different from that in West Africa, which is really African, independent Africa. The Rhodesias are very much under European domination, and the population distribution is also quite different from that in West Africa (in Southern Rhodesia one European to twelve Africans ; in Northern Rhodesia one to thirty-two). The official policy of the government is partnership and not the South African apartheid, but there is not yet much real racial integration.

Student Christian work is considerably less developed in Central Africa than in West Africa and also much less homogeneous. In

schools and in some universities, there are Scripture Union groups, SCM groups, and SCA groups, the latter initiated from South Africa, and even some confessional groups. There is no national Student Christian Movement, but in Southern Rhodesia there are district SCM committees in Bulawayo and Salisbury. These plan to join and to contact the Northern Rhodesia SCM committee. They have also decided to constitute a liaison committee with the Scripture Union to avoid overlapping of work and tension or rivalry. At present the Scripture Union work is strongest in European schools, the SCM in African schools. It is extremely important to maintain close contact with the Scripture Union and to gain their confidence, as the SCM work is planned. However, I think there is place and need for the SCM, if it is clearly interracial and ecumenical in character, building solidly on the biblical basis, while at the same time asking what it really means to be a Christian student in all realms of life in Africa today. There certainly is a tremendous need for a full-time travelling secretary to build up this work, perhaps along quite new lines. Africa needs the united witness of its Christian students and not our divisions. We must earnestly seek this unity, together with all existing Christian student groups, as well as with the different churches and missions and the YWCA and YMCA. In Rhodesia this united ecumenical witness must be made as courageously and clearly as possible especially with regard to the racial divisions.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

March 20 - April 9

The SCA of South Africa continues its impressive tradition, maintained for over sixty years and made familiar to the Federation by the many representatives it has sent to WSCF meetings throughout the years and through earlier travel diaries in *The Student World*. I shall not try, therefore, to describe its work as a whole, but rather to give a brief description of my program, and conclude with some general impressions.

My visit to the Union of South Africa came at a most critical time: I arrived by plane in Cape Town on the day on which the riots against the pass laws began in Sharpeville and Langa, and I left the Jan Smuts Airport on the day of the attempt on the life of Prime Minister Verwoerd in Johannesburg. These very serious events overshadowed my whole visit. Our friends there regretted that I had to see their country at such a difficult time, but I was not sorry. I think that in times of crisis the essential basic problems

are more easily discerned, and I am also convinced that such sharing of the difficulties and burdens of fellow Christians ensures a more profound and genuine unity in the future. After these three weeks spent in South Africa at this particular time, I feel myself bound to the Christians there in a very special way, and for that I am deeply grateful, although the days spent there were not easy.

Before describing my travels and program, I must emphasize one thing — otherwise I shall have to repeat it again and again : the deep friendship, hospitality, and love with which I was met everywhere. It was really moving. I think the SCA feels very much isolated in many ways, and for this reason welcomes Federation visitors so warmly. I felt myself sustained throughout my strenuous three-week visit by the prayers and support of a living Christian community. For this, for the help of those who organized my visit, and for the kindness of the Rev. and Mrs. W. S. Conradie, who accompanied me on most of my travel, I can never be sufficiently grateful.

Stellenbosch and Cape Town

My first evening in Stellenbosch, headquarters of the SCA near Cape Town, gave me a picture of its work which I shall never forget : about 300 students attended a meeting in the SCA House and listened with keen interest to my talk on "The WSCF and its Tasks in Africa". I was amazed to hear that all 300 were Bible study leaders ! In the University of Stellenbosch, there are about 4,600 students, of whom about 2,000 belong to the SCA !

I spent the next day in the SCA office, except for a car trip to the charming old Huguenot village, Fransch Hoek, and an evening meeting at the SCA cafeteria with representatives from the university and clergy. There I learned more about the impressive work of the SCA : its membership of about 65,000 in 600 local groups ; its fifteen travelling secretaries ; its emphasis on Bible study, prayer, and especially mission (every Sunday, about 600 members of the Stellenbosch SCA go out to evangelize in the villages and locations) ; its well-planned finances ; its nearly twenty camp grounds around the country ; its publications, etc. For nearly ten years, the SCA has been organized into five linguistic and racial branches — Afrikaans, English, Bantu, Coloured, and Indian. This division was made before the institution of the government policy as expressed in the Bantu Education Act, in order to strengthen the work in the different groups. The largest and clearly dominant group is the Afrikaans. Its work in secondary schools and Afrikaans universities is very

strong. In Cape Town I spent an evening with the committee of the Western Region SCA, discussing the differences and relations between the SCM and the IVF, and the WSCF and the IFES. I think my experiences in Finland were perhaps of some help here. The SCA in Cape Town and in the Western Region emphasizes rather exclusively personal religion, but I do not think that at the moment it is seriously considering withdrawing from the WSCF. In this situation, the existence of a separate student YMCA at the university is somewhat understandable. I saw some coloured students on the university grounds, although unfortunately most of them have already moved to the new coloured university in Belvilli, twenty-two miles from Stellenbosch, with 180 students.

At Fort Hare, the first African university college in South Africa, now one of the three so-called Bantu tribal colleges, I met for the first time in South Africa African groups on both the high school and university level. I had an experience here which was repeated time and time again: the African Christian students in the Bantu branch of the SCA were keen to discuss the political and racial questions which the Afrikaans groups seemed to discuss very little, the English-speaking only a little more!

Durban and Pretoria

Riots and demonstrations were going on during my whole stay in Durban, and because of the emergency regulations we had to cancel several of our planned meetings. We were, however, able to visit another of the new Bantu tribal colleges, which is still under construction in Ngoya. I must confess that it made a depressing impression. Of course it was not yet finished, and it will in the future have more than thirty-eight students, but the worst thing about it is its terrible isolation — both geographical and academic — even from the other Bantu tribes. To my mind it is tragic that, in the future, even university education will be in completely isolated groups according to races and even tribes.

On the evening of the same day, we had a contrasting experience: we attended a presentation in the Durban City Hall of Alan Paton's musical, *Mkhumbane*. The hall was crowded and the audience completely interracial. A full-day symposium had been planned for the following day at Alan Paton's residence, but because of the uncertainties of the situation, it was held instead in the YMCA, one of the few places where interracial gatherings are possible. Thirty students were present, half of them Africans and the rest Europeans. We had common meals. The discussion was most

interesting — frank and open. This was one of the most encouraging experiences I had in South Africa, as it was the one occasion on which I saw European and non-European (as they are called) students really meet and confront each other.

I spent my last days in South Africa in Pretoria, where I finally had the opportunity to visit one of the new locations (such visits were more difficult than in normal times) in Atteridgeville. The buildings were quite good, new and clean, and although hundreds upon hundreds of these small, red-brick, iron-roofed houses create an impression of monotony, they certainly are an enormous improvement over the "shanty towns".

Some impressions

Now a few of my lasting impressions of South Africa :

1. First of all : the strength of the work of the SCA. Its spirit, members, and program are most impressive. Its emphasis is clearly on the basic questions of faith : conversion, evangelism, Bible study, prayer, intercession, all related to the personal problems of the individual Christian. It is a spiritually strong Movement, and as such has a great contribution to make within the WSCF. But perhaps it also has something to learn, especially from the Federation emphasis on the relevance of Bible study and Christian faith to all aspects of life, including the social and political, since Jesus Christ is Lord of all. The SCA has much in common with the Finnish SCM of the 1930's and 1940's, and I think both can still draw much from the ecumenical fellowship of the Federation. The SCA gives its members an excellent basis for their personal commitment to Jesus Christ, and they should be helped to formulate on this foundation their Christian convictions for all realms of life.

I have commented on the keenness with which the African students discussed the burning political, social, and racial questions. I am convinced it would be of great help for all students in South Africa if these difficult, delicate questions could be faced openly and courageously by all the branches together, in the light of their common Christian faith.

2. Isolation is the word which in many ways best characterizes South Africa today. There is first the geographical isolation. But there is also the linguistic, the denominational, and the racial isolation of each of its entities. Not only do the different racial groups live in desperate isolation from each other, but also the cultural and linguistic groups, and even the churches. I was deeply shocked to

realize how little genuine contact and confrontation there is, for instance, between the Afrikaans- and English-speaking people, or between the Dutch Reformed Church and the Anglican and other more or less English churches. I stayed in the homes of families of these different groups, and it was like living in different countries.

Although the SCA is divided according to linguistic and racial groups, it is one of the very few movements in South Africa today which includes all races in its work and makes some meeting between them possible, although certainly not very much. I found much longing among the students in the various branches for more contact with one another, for more discussion and fellowship. According to all reports, the SCA's multiracial Life and Mission of the Church Conference in July 1960 was a great event, for it provided just such meeting and confrontation. I know that many within the SCA ask whether the division into linguistic and racial branches is not in itself an obstacle to witness and to real meeting, even though it may be practical because of the present educational system.

One of the most encouraging developments since I was there is the plan for the December 1960 conference of the World Council of Churches on the present difficult situation in South Africa. I have also heard that there has recently been much more open and frank discussion of these problems within the Dutch Reformed Church and other Christian organizations than previously.

3. The general atmosphere in South Africa, as I saw it, was very heavy. Everyone was profoundly concerned. It was a suffering country, and I cannot say who felt this suffering most deeply. I know very well that I am unable to judge the situation from outside as do those who live in the country, but at the same time, I am personally convinced that the only positive solution in South Africa can be found on the basis of the New Testament teaching which is simple and clear: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, but all are one in Jesus Christ." The only possible attitude towards our fellow Christians is one of confidence and trust. As we live in fellowship with one another, as the Body of Christ, we are taught to suffer and grow together, to carry each other's burdens, and to correct one another, and above all, to be joined together by the Head of the Body himself, Jesus Christ.

"Africa Year"

Since my visit to South Africa, the Life and Mission of the Church Conference in Strasbourg and the WSCF General Committee meeting in Greece have been held. At both of these meetings, Africa and

Africans were very much in the foreground: about fifty Africans were in Strasbourg, and about twenty in Greece. In many ways this was "Africa Year" in Federation meetings as well as in the United Nations. I want to mention three signs of this:

1. Seven of our member Movements in Africa changed status at the General Committee meeting: the SCMs of Sierra Leone and Ghana became fully affiliated members of the WSCF, and the Movements in Liberia, Ivory Coast, Dahomey, Basutoland, and Madagascar associated members.

2. The WSCF General Committee passed the following resolution:

We confirm the unity of the Body of Christ as the ground of the community of our Federation life, and therefore reject all forms of segregation and discrimination and those patterns of separation that are based on race, colour, or ethnic origin. "We intend to stay together" in Christ, and therefore refuse to judge one another for sins that are committed by all. We ask our member Movements to examine their own fellowship and the structures basic to their association in order to become aware of all forms of separation and segregation, and to work for the removal of these. Reports of progress should be submitted to the next General Committee.

This statement of policy was accepted unanimously, and a WSCF study commission on race was set up.

3. The General Committee decided that two important conferences should be held in Africa in the coming years: a Leadership Training Course for Central, Southern, and Eastern Africa, and Madagascar, in the Ecumenical Centre in Mindolo, Northern Rhodesia, in January 1961, and an All-Africa Life and Mission of the Church Regional Conference in December 1961 - January 1962.

Our prayer is that, through all these new developments, the Federation may serve to strengthen the Christian witness of the SCMs in new Africa and be strengthened throughout the world by the work and witness of African Christian students.

BOOK REVIEWS

WELTKIRCHEN LEXIKON : HANDBUCH DER ÖKUMENE, commissioned by the Deutsche Evangelische Kirchentag and edited by Franklin H. Littell and Hans Hermann Walz. Kreuz-Verlag, Stuttgart, 1960. 896 pp. 48 black and white illustrations. DM 58.

The *Deutsche Evangelische Kirchentag* has become known in the ecumenical movement not only as an important aspect of the life of the German Church but also among Protestants as an event in which ecumenism becomes real to them. It is therefore natural that the *Kirchentag* should have commissioned this "Ecumenical Handbook". The President of the Kirchentag, Dr. Reinold von Thadden-Trieglaff, indicates in his introduction that the book should "serve first and foremost the congregation", and thus make a contribution to the bringing of ecumenism into the local church. The book's more than 1,700 columns give information about churches, confessions, and religious movements, from the Anglican Church to the Non-Church Movement in Japan; about the non-Christian religions and historic intellectual movements, from Confucianism to communism; about the ecumenical movement, its conferences, organizations, and great leaders, from John R. Mott to W. A. Visser 't Hooft, from the international youth organizations to the great confessional world federations, from Edinburgh to New Delhi. Relevant attitudes and opinions of churches and ecumenical bodies on ethical and sociological questions can be found under such headings as disarmament, property, church, and school. Similarly, under such headings as Holy Communion, the creation, the Trinity, baptism, eschatology, the *Handbook* deals with doctrinal issues, describing the various interpretations given them at different periods and by different churches, and also the part they play in the ecumenical discussion. Under each country we find information about missionary and church history, the present form of the church in this country, and also statistics on church membership.

The articles are written by experts on the subject; for example, the article "Ecumenical" is by W. A. Visser 't Hooft, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches; "Student Work" is by Philippe Maury, General Secretary of the World Student Christian Federation, "CIMADE" by Madeleine Barot, one of its Directors. In spite of this, or should one say precisely because of it, the articles are generally

as objective as possible. This may sometimes fail to apply when the subjects treated are those viewed critically in the ecumenical world ; for example, the article on "Marxism" is written by a critical expert ; the article "Moral Rearmament", on the other hand, is by someone who was himself a member of the MRA, and so is probably too favourable for the taste of many readers.

The bibliographies included in each section are extremely useful for those who want further information, even though there is a preponderance of German literature and only the most important foreign works are mentioned. The index includes cross references as well as the section headings. The list of authors reveals the truly ecumenical nature of the book : over half the four hundred or more writers are prominent non-German theologians and leaders of the ecumenical movement in all parts of the world. The attractiveness of the book is enhanced by photographs from the history of the ecumenical movement (events, personalities, the religious life of the different confessions, etc.), of church art (painting, sculpture, and church architecture, old and new), and church history (personalities of church history from the Middle Ages to the present day).

We must be grateful to the editors, the American Professor Franklin H. Littell and the German Dr. Hans Hermann Walz, and to the specialists, for the important service they have rendered through their careful and comprehensive survey of the ecumenical movement.

ELISABETH ADLER.

THEOLOGIE DER MISSIONARISCHEN VERKÜNDIGUNG (Theology of Evangelism), by Hans Jochen Margull. Ev. Verlagswerk, Stuttgart. 336 pp. DM 24. Soon to be published in English by the Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia.

This book is of great importance if only for the very simple reason that it provides information about a body of literature which is not easily available in its entirety. It includes a thirty-five page bibliography of ecumenical publications, consisting mainly of speeches, minutes, statements, messages, comments, reports, suggestions for study, and articles. Moreover, the author uses many quotations for which exact and complete references are given. However, it is not his intention to make a popular synopsis of the ecumenical discussion on the problem of evangelism over the past ten years, for people who have no time to read the material for themselves. "An effort has been made to deal systematically with this important aspect of the ecumenical discussion ; this has hardly been attempted up to now. Nothing more than an outline, or perhaps better, a preliminary clarification, of a theology has been attempted"

(p. 107). Yet this is not a dull, scientific, abstract dissertation : it is a fascinating book, which can be read by the interested layman. No one who takes seriously the World Student Christian Federation's project on "The Life and Mission of the Church" should fail to read it.

Those for whom "ecumenical" means nothing more than "meeting one another in a spirit of co-operation, with no greater expectation than that, through this coming together and ecumenical dialogue (which is not finally binding), the wide gap may be narrowed, or even closed at some denominationally uncomplicated points" (p. 17), will first of all be astonished, if not shocked, that a new starting-point for a theology of evangelism can emerge from a discussion involving not only different churches but also different theological traditions.

In the first part of the book the author demonstrates that the raising of the eschatological question by the Evanston Assembly of the World Council of Churches not only challenged the previous ecumenical discussion, but also set forth a new starting-point for the theological self-understanding of the *oikumene*. "The life of the ecumenical movement must be biblically based on the perception of, and participation in, the eschatological action of God in Jesus Christ with the whole world." The question then arises whether the eschatological is not, indeed, the category of ecumenism. The Evanston theme, "Jesus Christ, the Hope of the World" — which originated in a theological study of the eschatological basis for mission — is the message and basis of evangelism. Margull records this as the conclusion of the ecumenical discussions at Evanston and at the International Missionary Council meeting at Willingen, both of which are described in some detail. Traditional missionary motives, such as the pietistic (the salvation of individual souls), the ecclesiastical (the winning of new church members), the philanthropic evolutionary (the remedying of bad social conditions), and the apocalyptic (the acceleration of the coming of the Kingdom of God), are all called in question in the ecumenical discussion, both because of the untenability of the conception of the *Corpus Christianum*, and also because of the renewed certainty in the ecumenical movement that Jesus Christ, who is himself the missionary and in whose Messianic work the Church is permitted to share, will in the fullness of time gather to himself his people from all the world. This implies the renunciation of all propaganda, of the calculation of the success or failure of evangelism, and of the expansion of the Church as evangelism's aim.

The second part of the book deals with "The Church : Its Situation and Activity". The *raison d'être* of the Church is its mission to the

world. Wherever efforts are made to evangelize, it will be discovered that this is impossible without a revolution in church life. The fact that evangelism has such a central place in the ecumenical discussion makes clear the extent to which the ecumenical movement must be understood as a movement of repentance. The course of ecumenical discussions on evangelism, for example those in connection with the work of the Department on Evangelism of the World Council of Churches, shows that the situation and activity of the Church must be central to any consideration of evangelism. Margull makes a critical analysis of the sociological captivity of the Church, its complacency, its narrowness, and secularization. He analyses the "new *vis-à-vis*" of the Church in the West: a radically secularized society, and finally concludes that it is through evangelism in this society that the Church will be renewed. Here the congregation is referred to almost exclusively as a community. "If the life and conduct of the Church are not in themselves good news for the society in which it lives, it cannot witness to the good news of the coming of God in Jesus Christ" (p. 195).

The third part of the book deals with the unity of the Church. If it is the whole Church of Jesus Christ which evangelizes, and not the individual churches, then the question must be raised of the relationship between evangelism and unity. Once again the author traces the course of the ecumenical discussion. For example, the World Council of Churches' Assembly at Amsterdam no longer differentiated sharply between evangelism at home and overseas. The question of the meaning of baptism was revived in connection with the discussion of whether evangelism must be directed exclusively to non-baptized people. The fact that the unity of the Church is essential to its mission and that through the fulfilment of its mission it will achieve unity, was also emphasized. "There is only one way for the Church to come closer to unity: to take its missionary task seriously. On the other hand, it cannot really fulfil its missionary task if it is not concerned about the establishment of the one Church" (W. Freytag, quoted on p. 255).

Margull makes clear that his conception of evangelism is based on what has been said in ecumenical discussions. He distinguishes evangelism, which must have as its aim individual commitment to Jesus Christ as Lord, from the Church's more general task of creating an atmosphere in which it can make contact with the world, however useful this may be as a first step. To evangelize is to share in the mission of Christ to the world: it is "hope in action" (p. 259).

ELISABETH ADLER.

ST. GRÉGOIRE DE PALAMAS ET LA MYSTIQUE ORTHODOXE by Jean Meyendorff. Editions du Seuil, Paris, Maîtres Spirituels No. 20. 187 pp.

The Orthodox Church has become more widely known in Western Christianity during our generation. Two factors in particular have contributed to this better understanding of the mystical tradition of the Orthodox Church: the emigration of Russians to the West and the ecumenical movement have both provided opportunities for closer contacts. Father Meyendorff belongs to a generation which intends to interpret Orthodox Christianity living in the West to other Western Christians. His small booklet on one of the representatives of mediaeval Orthodox theology, St. Gregory of Palamas, is an introduction to the thinking of this theologian of the "hesychastic" tradition, which represents a synthesis of the two main streams of Eastern monastic tradition, the community type and the eremitic type. In his theology he was also a great proponent of the synthesis between the contemplative life and the sacramental and liturgical life of the Church. The author admits that such ideas had been long in preparation, but nevertheless, it was Gregory who gave them clear expression. This booklet is therefore a good introduction to Orthodox mystical theology, especially because it sketches the context of the whole Orthodox tradition in which Gregory of Palamas lived. A word of appreciation should also be added for the excellent reproductions which give a good impression of Orthodox iconography.

VILMOS VAJTA.

CHRISTIAN HOLINESS, by Stephen Neill. Lutterworth Press, London. 134 pp. 15s.

This book was first given in Spanish as the Carnahan lectures in Buenos Aires in 1953, and has since been translated and revised by the author. The book is all the more welcome because the subject treated is one about which there is not a great deal of "ecumenical theology". Attempts were made to approach this subject through a study commission at the two last WSCF General Committees, in Tutzing on "Holy Living" and in Salonica on "Christian Community". In both of these commissions such a book would have been of great help.

The book contains seven chapters, six giving the biblical and theological basis, and the last — "What then, do we preach?" giving some practical advice. The whole study begins by presenting the main thought of a later Lutheran theologian, Rudolf Otto (author of *Das Heilige*). The two main emphases of this first chapter,

"The Biblical Idea of Holiness", are : 1) ethics is simply one aspect of religion — there must always be first an experience of the *mysterium tremendum*, as Otto puts it ; and 2) ethics, holiness, is not a matter of private and inner consecration, but always primarily a matter of relationships. "Its aim must be the preservation of life, the safeguarding of life. It must be directed towards the creation of a society in which men and women can live and serve one another ; in which man can exercise those creative capacities which God has bestowed upon him" (p. 17). This theme of "holiness in relationships" — family, church, society, etc. — runs through the whole book, stressing the impossibility of distinguishing between personal and social ethics.

Chapters II and III deal with the two commonest, opposing errors made in theology and church history on questions of holiness. "The perfectionist error", represented by movements like gnosticism, mysticism, and quietism, stresses that sanctification is a separate experience, as "second blessing", and makes a distinction between "ordinary and spiritual" Christians. According to the author, this error derives largely from Methodism. Its great mistakes are a kind of dualism, a "disruption of the unity of human nature" ; antinomianism ; spiritual tyranny, and a failure to understand the depth and reality of sin. It is based on a fundamental misconception regarding God's dealing with mankind in creation and redemption. But the author also stresses that movements of this kind have had a task to perform in the history of the Church. "Whenever the Church sinks down into the placid acceptance of mediocrity, the perfectionists appear as gadflies to bring it again into alertness... One of the strangest dispensations in the history of the Church is that it has been only through the growth of heresy that God has provided for the full explication of the truth" (p. 27).

This applies also to the opposing "conformist error", that "of eliminating that dimension of ultimate demand and ultimate self-commitment" (p. 44). This is the error of the "multitudinist" Church as compared to the "gathered" Church. Its weaknesses are hidden forms of legalism ("every kind of conformism has the principle of law somewhere near its heart" — p. 47), and predestinarianism ("an almost gnostic idea of a natural division between the sons of light and the sons of darkness" — p. 58). (By the way, I have found many new forms, and some strange ones, of different "isms" in Bishop Neill's book !) This misconception must be met and challenged in the name of the Holy (p. 59). "It is the plain fact that, as things now are, each one of us is from his birth the centre of his own universe... As long as man remains the centre of his own world, everything, religion included, can be used in his service" (p. 61).

The fourth chapter, "The Place of Holiness", stresses the "places" in which holiness must be lived : Church and world. "The Church is the only place in which a Christian form of holiness can be worked out" (p. 64). Here the author again emphasizes that in the Christian world holiness is to be thought of primarily in terms of relationships. "We only grow to real selfhood, to maturity, through our relationships with other selves... In this relationship love is the only rule" (pp. 64-66). But it must also be lived out in the world, for the Church is set apart only for the sake of the world. Here the author quotes the famous words of Bonhoeffer : "It is only by living completely in this world that one learns to believe", and he continues, "To be an apostle in these days means to accept the life of men... to penetrate to every corner of the life of men" (p. 76).

The chapter on "The Spirit of Holiness" is a biblical exposition on the work of the Holy Spirit, stressing that he is the Spirit of the risen Christ. "He will complete and perfect the work of Jesus, but he will add nothing to it" (p. 82). He is there "to hold the spotlight on Christ". In the divine economy in which we are now living, "the dispensation of the Holy Spirit", the elements of unity and witness are central.

The following chapter, "Conflict and Temptation", approaches the practical questions, dealing with the unique situation of the Church and individual Christians who are already living in the new world order, yet are unable to deny the reality of their contacts with the old. "The Church is set in a missionary relationship to the world in which and for which Christ died. That explains why it has been, is, and will be till the end of time, the Church under the Cross" (p. 98). In the individual Christian there are the astonishing depths of human nature. Again and again we have to confess, "I don't think this part of me has heard of God yet". "This dark other self of instinct, impulse, emotion, whatever it may be, is also a self whom God loves, and who can be redeemed by Christ. But he cannot be redeemed unless He is recognized and acknowledged" (p. 102).

The last chapter, "What, then, do we preach ?", begins by underlining how Luther's idea of our "remaining always sinners" has often been misunderstood, for it is above all a reaction against some false conceptions. According to the author, there is a great need for a more positive approach, which would challenge the ordinary man by a passionate proclamation of a biblical doctrine of holiness. While I agree here to some extent, I should express it differently, for this way may leave the door open to legalism. Modern men need above all the message of God's love in Christ, but certainly also its practical implications for everyday life — this is the doctrine of sanctification.

I also think that Luther's conception of forgiveness may be interpreted here in too negative a sense, as the taking away of guilt, without stressing its tremendous power. However, when he speaks of grace (p. 123), the author has this full, positive conception. I like very much his combination of the "holiness" and the "wholeness" of man: "Holiness in the Christian sense does mean mastery over life... the restoration of life by recovering of its relationship to its source... Wholeness, as has so often been pointed out, is just another name for what Christians mean by holiness — the wholeness of human personality as seen in Jesus of Nazareth, the wholeness of a society in which people really love one another, the wholeness of a world redeemed" (p. 116). This wholeness finds its centre in Jesus Christ. So Christian holiness has "only one heart and one centre, Jesus Christ himself". Therefore "one of the essential ingredients in Christian holiness is steady, patient contemplation of Jesus as He was in the fullness and simplicity of His human life" (p. 119).

Then the author goes on in a practical way to stress the importance of discipline and self-discipline in the Christian life, pointing out that "we are to expect to be sharers in the victory of Jesus" (p. 123), which means living a life where one is "at home in the unseen world", a life where everything is brought "into relationship to Christ", a life characterized by equanimity, a sense of humour, above all by the capacity to laugh at oneself, a life filled with deep compassion, joy, penitence, and glad surprise.

This book is certainly a valuable guide for both individuals and groups who want to study the doctrine of sanctification.

INGA-BRITA CASTRÉN.

DOCUMENTS OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE LAY APOSTOLATE, published by the Permanent Committee for the International Congresses of the Lay Apostolate, Rome. 3 Vols., paper cover. \$5.00, Lira 3,200.

In October 1957 over 2,000 delegates from nearly ninety countries met in Rome to consider the theme, "The Laity and the Crisis of a Modern World: Responsibilities and Formation". Some of the addresses given at that conference, together with basic studies, texts, and other preparatory material, have been published in three volumes under the headings: (I) Laymen in the Church, (II) Laymen Face the World, and (III) Forming Apostles.

Together they indicate the great progress in Roman Catholic concern for the lay apostolate since the first international Congress on the same theme in 1952. The three volumes are challenging, full

of missionary enthusiasm, and the heady new wine of a recovered truth. However, the definition of that truth is confusing, certainly, to a Christian who is not a Roman Catholic, and probably to many Roman Catholics as well. Despite the acceptance of the concept of the people of God as one *laos*, there is an obvious difficulty in squaring the idea of a lay apostolate with that of the apostolate of the hierarchy. The address of Pius XII makes it clear that "apostle" as applied to a layman may be equally accurately translated "collaborator". Collaboration in the apostolate of the hierarchy seems to be the precise work of the committed layman. Nor was it a part of the Pope's thinking that the word "apostle" should be applied to all the people of God. He makes it clear in part of his opening address, saying, "Not all Christians are called to the lay apostolate in its strict sense. We have already said that the Bishop should be able to choose collaborators among those whom he finds willing and able, for willingness alone is not sufficient. Lay apostles will therefore always form an *élite*, not because they keep apart from others but, quite on the contrary, because they are capable of attracting and influencing others."¹

His conclusion, which stresses that a lay apostolate has always existed in the Church, is weakened by citing two kings and the sister of an emperor as three of the four examples given. And it is clear that Pius XII wanted the clerical control and organization of lay movements to be beyond doubt. "If today, there is awareness of the lay apostolate, and if the term lay apostle is one of the most widely used when speaking of the activity of the Church, it is because the collaboration of the laity with the Hierarchy was never so necessary nor practised in such an organized way as it is now."²

Cardinal Pizzardo, on the other hand, at the opening session, gives a definition as wide and evangelical in scope as any free churchman could ask. He begins :

Apostolus — one sent — ambassador. The apostolate is the work of one who seeks to make known the will of His Lord and Master, that is to say, to make Jesus Christ known and loved. Obviously, to make him known and loved by others, we must first know and love him ourselves ; that is the indispensable foundation of the apostolate.

The forms of activities of the apostolate are varied : we can make Jesus Christ known and loved by the example of a life of faith, virtue

¹ Texts, Second International Congress for the Lay Apostolate, Volume I, p. 23.

² *Ibid.*, p. 33.

and piety ; by the teaching of evangelical truths, through writing or the spoken word ; also by the practice of works of mercy which include activities of a social order¹.

However, he, too, makes it clear that the separate organs or members in the Body of Christ, in the New Testament imagery, are all hierarchy. It appears, therefore, that a uniform definition of the lay apostolate has not yet emerged in Roman Catholic thought and experience. Canon law and classical theology make the word "apostle" appear to be an overstatement with regard to the layman except in so far as he exercises a delegated responsibility of the hierarchy. On the other hand, missionary zeal, the Christian response to the world's paganism, and the recovery of a New Testament expression of theology are leading a part of the Roman Catholic Church to a theology of the laity and a mission of the laity that are truly revolutionary.

Perhaps the most balanced statement of the apostolic vocation of the laity is in Basic Text A/2 printed at the end of Volume I. There the layman is defined as "the Christian who, by Faith and Baptism, has become a member of the Church acquiring, within the community, the dignity of a 'person' with the corresponding rights and duties." ² Two restrictions are made : 1) He does not receive Holy Orders, the source of the power of a minister of the Church. Administering the means of salvation belongs to the clergy. 2) The layman does not give up his situation in the world. This position is clarified later in the same document by this statement :

The specific task of the clergy is to distribute the means of salvation and to govern the community in its religious life. The specific vocation of the religious, in relation to the community, is to show, by his life, the importance of Christian perfection. The layman has neither of these special vocations. His general vocation as a Christian is to prepare, to promote and to prolong the Church's sanctifying action — which the clergy is first to serve — by enabling this grace of sanctification to be more readily, more deeply and more widely received and effective³.

The world which stands in need of this sanctifying grace is surveyed in the second volume. Addresses by citizens of all continents underlining national needs and lay responsibility are followed by discussions of lay responsibility in international organizations and politics.

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 47.

² *Ibid.*, p. 217.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 219-20.

Particularly interesting to the university world is a symposium on *Modern Society in Search of God*. The introduction divides the theme under three headings: (A) Man, Science, God; (B) Man, Art, God; (C) Man, Law, God, concluding in each case that "God is in Sight!" The chairman of the symposium, a Spaniard, writes: "Our duty as Christians, our mission as Catholics is to enter deeply into these social realities of our time, and to make conscious the underlying tendencies, not by means of apologetic arguments, but through an intimate sharing in our brothers' sorrows and joys, until their indirect seeking after God is crowned with clarity and certainty."¹

The third volume discusses the role of family, parish, school, and Catholic apostolate movements in the basic formation of apostles. The emphasis on prayer and charity in each context is striking. It is apparent that the Roman formula for lay training calls for a deeply personal spiritual formation on the one hand, and a practical training for community action on the other. It is a balance of piety and action seldom found in one person. In most communions (and possibly among Roman Catholics also) prayer and meditation seldom go hand in hand with shrewd political and social action. There is much to be learned in these studies for a missionary church that seeks to be in, but not of, the world.

The volumes are a valuable supplement to the works of Father Yves Congar and others on the layman in the Roman Catholic Church, because they present a panorama of the world-wide Roman thinking and action on the subject. The very diversity and possible conflict revealed in the addresses gives evidence of the earnestness and honesty with which the speakers have embraced the theme. These texts are a reminder and a challenge to Protestantism, Orthodoxy, and Anglicanism to make the same effort to define the roles of clergy and laymen, and to find suitable patterns for lay action.

SAMUEL J. WYLIE.

A NEW QUEST OF THE HISTORICAL JESUS, by James M. Robinson. Studies in Biblical Theology No. 25. SCM Press, London. 128 pp. 9s. 6d.

Am I right in saying that one thing which disappointed the students most at the Strasbourg Teaching Conference was the fact that as a whole it was not much concerned with subjects of current interest? If the Federation is to continue its traditional "pioneering

¹ *Op. cit.*, Volume II, p. 206.

role" in the life and mission of the Church, it must always be up to date, always participating in the contemporary scientific discussion.

There may have been a thousand technical reasons which made it impossible to bring certain outstanding scholars to Strasbourg, but one felt it was rather a shame that the "post-Bultmann" theologians, for instance, were so poorly represented. We may disagree completely with their thinking, but that is not the point. The question is whether we really know what is going on in contemporary theology (even if, as in this case, it is mainly German theology). Do we know what theologians like E. Kasemann, G. Bornkamm, E. Fuchs, E. Dinkler, and H. Conzelmann are after?

James Robinson, in *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus*, puts it as follows: "... This second phase of post-war German theology... sees its task as that of carrying through a critical revision of Bultmann's position, out of which revision the theological synthesis of the future will grow." This may be his personal opinion, and others may think differently, but this does not change the necessity for us to become acquainted with their thinking, and I believe this book provides a good introduction to the current theological discussion especially in Germany. In fact it is *ein Kapitel deutscher Theologiegeschichte*. I am very happy to be able to recommend it to my fellow theological students, especially those who have begun to think seriously (at the Strasbourg Teaching Conference or elsewhere) about the problem of how man, today, meets Christ Jesus, *i.e.* Jesus of Nazareth and not just a Christ Jesus. We must not forget that the origin of the quest of the historical Jesus was an effort to escape the limitations and restrictions of dogma. Dr. Robinson writes:

... it is characteristic of the twentieth-century theology to emphasize one aspect of this identification (*i.e.* the identification in the kerygma of the humiliated Jesus and the exalted Lord): the historical Jesus cannot be isolated from the Christ of faith, as the original quest (*i.e.* the nineteenth-century's quest of the historical Jesus) attempted to do. Yet, as the evangelists point out, the other aspect of the identification is equally important: the Christ of faith cannot be separated from the historical Jesus, if we do not wish to find "a myth in the place of history, a heavenly being in the place of the Nazarene" (p. 18).

In this book, the author first points out the impossibility and illegitimacy of the nineteenth-century's quest of the historical Jesus (Chapter II), then shows the possibility of a new quest (Chapter III), investigates its legitimacy (Chapter IV), and finally attempts to

get the actual work under way (Chapter V, "The procedure of a new quest").

Finally, I should like to draw attention to the footnotes in this book, which are particularly instructive.

LIEM KHIEM JANG.

THE MAN-WOMAN RELATION IN CHRISTIAN THOUGHT, by Derrick Sherwin Bailey. Longmans, Green and Co. 1959. 314 pp. 30s.

The praise of this book by a reviewer quoted on the dust-cover includes the remark that, though it unearths novel and unfamiliar facts, it is not exciting or sensational. While this may be true of its manner of presentation, it can hardly apply to this extraordinary procession of ideas, from the days of "the Church's embarrassment and fear in the face of physical sexuality" to the contemporary belief of, for example, Barth (paraphrased by Dr. Bailey) that "the relational image of God in its manward aspect is specifically and exclusively sexual, and consists in the general relationship of man and woman."

Dr. Bailey says in his introduction that the book is the result of eight years' teaching to students and clergy on the theology and ecclesiastical history of sexual relation. It is the first attempt of which he is aware to trace the history of the sexual tradition of the Christian Church. After two brief chapters on primitive Christianity and its background and the New Testament treatment of sex, he deals in considerable detail with the currents of thought and disciplines of the early Church, mediaeval Christendom, and the Reformation. He restricts himself, then, to Anglican thought in the Tudor, Jacobean, and Caroline periods, and finally has two excellent chapters, one summarizing and evaluating the tradition for today and the other sketching the basis of a new theology of sex. (Those who wish, or need, to "taste" the book, could read these last two chapters alone with profit.)

It is closely written and elaborately documented and needs to be read very carefully. Much of the material will be of special interest to those with some prior knowledge of theology and church history, but all of it can be absorbed and appreciated by the intelligent and interested layman. A real understanding of the present is always assisted by a knowledge of the past, and students and others interested in the views of sex current in the Church and the world today find here profound and illuminating material to take their thinking further.

Of the many interesting strands woven into Dr. Bailey's study one may mention as an example his estimation of the part played by non-theological factors in the development of the Church's sexual thought. Augustine, whose influence in this sphere has been far-reaching, is seen (p. 58) as "one in whom the venereal impulse was unusually strong and persistent", and whose theological speculation on sexual questions "was profoundly influenced by his personal experience". His personal history is related in some detail as relevant background. Later, Dr. Bailey suggests that a strong underlying motive in the fight for clerical celibacy by some mediaeval popes was that they hoped by this means to forge (p. 151) "an instrument by means of which the dominance of the ecclesiastical power in the West could be established and consolidated... a body of men set apart from the world and its life — owning no secular ties or obligation". As a final example, there is the personal background of the new spirit which enters the debate in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as Bacon and Taylor, two happily married men, contribute their speculation on the meaning of sex in the divine economy. Dr. Bailey considers it no accident that release from the bonds of celibacy is accompanied by an appreciation of marriage as a vocation in no way inferior to virginity, as, indeed, "a nursery of heaven". Taylor's view of the place of sexual pleasure in marriage constitutes what Dr. Bailey regards as the "first express recognition in theological literature of what may be termed the relational purpose of coitus" (p. 208).

In commenting on the predominantly negative character of the Church's sexual tradition, Dr. Bailey emphasizes that the Fathers and the Schoolmen did not depart from an original, wholesome notion of sex, but rather moulded according to Christian principles negative notions which they themselves inherited or which were current in their society. His own plea is for a return to basic biblical principles enlightened by contemporary studies, and for a response to the "challenge from without" of modern medical knowledge and developments in psychology, sociology, and philosophy.

This plea he launches in his final chapter, "Towards a Theology of Sex". It begins with a brief but valuable examination of terminology, notably of the terms, "sex", "sexual", and "venereal", the precise use of which he recommends for further debate. It goes on, then, through an examination of the biblical myths of creation, to the views of Barth and Brunner, contemporary sexual attitudes and cultural stereotypes, and finally to a theological approach to the meaning of sex, which is presented not as a conclusion, but as "a bridge leading to further and more specific studies in sexual relation",

- THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT, by Kenneth Slack. Edinburgh House Press, London. 44 pp., paper cover. 2s.
- THE CHRISTIAN APPROACH TO THE ANIMIST, by W. T. Harris and E. G. Parrinder. Edinburgh House Press, London. 64 pp., paper cover. 2s. 6d.
- THE WAY IN AFRICA, by George Wayland Carpenter. Edinburgh House Press, London. 122 pp., paper cover. 6s. 6d.
- PALESTINE AND THE BIBLE, by Denis Baly. World Christian Books No. 33. Lutterworth Press, London. 84 pp., paper cover. 2s. 6d.
- REDISCOVERING THE BIBLE, by Bernhard W. Anderson. Lutterworth Press, London (first British edition). 272 pp. 21s.
- THIS WORLD AND THE BEYOND. THE MARBURG SERMONS OF RUDOLF BULTMANN. Lutterworth Press, London. 248 pp. 27s. 6d.
- UNDER THE WINGS OF THEIR PRAYERS. The Holy Communion Service with Prayers for Private Use taken from Eastern Sources, compiled by Margaret I. Linsey. Basil Blackwell, Oxford. 29 pp.
- JOHN SHINES THROUGH AUGUSTINE, by A. P. Carleton. World Christian Books No. 34. Lutterworth Press, London. 80 pp., paper cover. 2s. 6d.
- THE HISTORICITY OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL, by A. J. B. Higgins. Lutterworth Press, London. 82 pp. 6s. 6d.
- THE UNIVERSITY TODAY: ITS ROLE AND PLACE IN SOCIETY. An International Study, edited by Bernard Ducret and Rafe-uz-Zaman. Published with the assistance of UNESCO by World University Service, Geneva, Switzerland. 333 pp. Special price of Swiss francs 17.— for readers of *The Student World*.
- FAITH AND LEARNING, by Alexander Miller. Association Press, New York. 218 pp., paper cover.
- VISION AND ACHIEVEMENT 1796-1956. A HISTORY OF THE FOREIGN MISSIONS OF THE CHURCHES UNITED IN THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, by Elizabeth G. K. Hewat. Thomas Nelson and Sons, Edinburgh. 308 pp. 25s.
- THE THEOLOGICAL FOUNDATION OF LAW, by Jacques Ellul. Doubleday & Co., Garden City, New York. 140 pp. \$3.95.
- WHAT IS EVANGELISM? by Douglas Webster. The Highway Press, London. 194 pp., paper cover.
- THE RACIAL PROBLEM IN CHRISTIAN PERSPECTIVE, by Kyle Haselden. Lutterworth Press, London. 222 pp. 15s.

